DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 334 PS 009 070

TITLE	Background Materials Concerning Child and Family Services Act, 1975, H.R. 2966. Committee Print, 94th Congress, 2d Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	Dec 76
NOTE	138p.; Many pages of the original document are copyrighted and therefore not available. They are not included in the pagination
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Advocacy; *Child Rearing; *Child Welfare; *Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; Family (Sociological Unit); *Federal Legislation; *Government Role; Handicapped Children; Health Services; Information Dissemination; Minority Groups; News Media; Nutrition; Parent Participation; *Social Services; Speeches; Training
IDENTIFIERS	*Child and Family Services Act 1975

ABSTRACT

This document contains the text of Child and Family Services Act of 1975, H.R. 2966, and background materials concerning that act. Included are reprints of many newspaper and magazine articles as well as statements of members of Congress in response to the campaign against the bill. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

94th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

ED134334

Background Materials Concerning Child and Family Services Act, 1975, H.R. 2966

PREPARED BY THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

FOR THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PS 009070

DECEMBER 1976

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

78-410 O

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1976

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico
MICHAEL BLOUIN, Iowa
ROBERT J. CORNELL, Wisconsin
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
RONALD MOTTL, Ohio
TIM L. HALL, Illinois

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
VIRGINIA SMITH, Nebraska

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
ROBERT J. CORNELL, Wisconsin
EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
TIM L. HALL, Illinois
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Ex Officio*

ALPHONZO BELL, California
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
JAMES JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota, *Ex Officio*

FOREWORD

Over the past year, a deliberate effort has been made in many states throughout the country to spread false information concerning the Child and Family Services Act.

Leaflets have been distributed alleging that the bill, which has been sponsored by both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress, would give a child the right to sue his parents if they required him to go to Sunday school.

This same flyer claims that the bill would give children a legal right to organize into the equivalent of labor unions against their parents.

The leaflet, mimeographed and unsigned by any sponsoring organization, alleges as well that the bill would let the government take over the upbringing of children and make them wards of the State.

These allegations are totally unfounded and outrageous falsehoods. It is important, therefore, that the record be set straight and the false information about the Child and Family Services Act counteracted.

Press reports on the smear campaign, such as the following, have appeared in national and local publications across the country.

Christian Science Monitor: "The anonymous letters on which it is based consist almost entirely of distortion and outright falsehoods. Examination of the Congressional bill shows no section of it would give control of children to the government."

U.S. News & World Report editorial, "False Alarm": "The bill doesn't provide all those wild things the letter-writers fear . . . No such legislation is before this Congress, or ever has been . . ."

UAW Washington Report: ". . . Circulars and information which have no source indicated on it have made the rounds spreading lie upon lie . . . It's always hard for the truth to catch up to a lie once made."

The National Catholic Charities, National Council of Churches, United Methodist Church, United Church of Christ, Church of the Brethren, United Presbyterian Church and other religious groups in a joint statement: "These charges are totally inaccurate . . . to misrepresent the purpose and provisions of the legislation . . . is a disservice to all Americans concerned about families and children."

The Child and Family Services Act would provide for millions of preschool children and their families opportunities, on a completely voluntary basis, for participation in programs of prenatal care, nutrition services, day care and early medical diagnosis for handicapped children.

Reasonable debate should be encouraged to discuss the issues posed by the Child and Family Services Act. Any decisions reached about the legislation must be made on the factual substance of the bill.

The tactics of deception employed by the anonymous attack on the bill, however, have distorted the public's understanding of the measure at hand. It is important that the deliberation of this legislation be based on the facts and not on a misrepresentation of the bill's provisions. With this document, accurate public information can restore debate to a consideration of the truth.

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword iii
Text of the Child and Family Services Act, H.R. 2966 3
Anonymous flyer attacking Child and Family Services bill 77

Selected articles and other relevant materials:

Newsweek—April 5, 1976 81
Harper's Weekly—March 22, 1976 82
U.S. News & World Report—March 1, 1976 85
The Christian Science Monitor—February 24, 1976 87
Chicago Daily News—April 14, 1976 88
Chicago Daily News—March 27, 1976 89
The News and Courier (Charleston, S.C.)—March 7, 1976 91
The Washington Post—February 19, 1976 92
The Washington Star—February 3, 1976 93
Minneapolis Tribune—January 23, 1976 95
The Times-Picayune (New Orleans, La.)—January 16, 1976 96
St. Louis Post-Dispatch—December 28, 1975 97
Manchester Union Leader—December 27, 1975 99
The Indianapolis Star—December 12, 1975 100
Chicago Tribune—December 8, 1975 101
Dayton Daily News—December 7, 1975 102
The Indianapolis Star—December 3, 1975 103
The Kansas City Star—November 30, 1975 104
Houston Chronicle—November 9, 1975 106
The Washington Star—October 14, 1975 108
Letter from Senator Walter F. Mondale and Representative John Brademas to the Washington Star—October 16, 1975 109
London Sunday Times—September 5, 1976 111
The Goshen News—April 9, 1976 112
The Sun Chronicle (Attleboro-North Attleboro, Mass.)—March 9, 1976 113
The Sun Chronicle—March 3, 1976 114
The Riverton Ranger—February 11, 1976 115
The Tennessean—February 2, 1976 116
The Oregonian—January 5, 1976 117
The News-Dispatch (Michigan City, Ind.)—December 13, 1975 118
The News-Dispatch—December 12, 1975 120
The New Prague Times—December 11, 1975 121
The Elkhart Truth—December 11, 1975 122
Wabash Plain Dealer—November 21, 1975 123
The Ann Arbor News—November 16, 1975 124
The Grand Rapids Press—November 11, 1975 125
WSBT-AM/FM/TV (South Bend, Ind.)—October 25, 26, and 27, 1975 126
WSBT-AM/FM/TV—November 8, 9, and 10, 1975 127
The Elkhart Truth—November 4, 1975 128
The South Bend Tribune—November 2, 1975 129
Times-Union (Warsaw, Ind.)—October 14, 1975 130
The Baptist Message—February 12, 1976 131
Outlook (Council for American Private Education)—February 1976 133
PTA Today—February 1976 134
Washington Report (UAW)—February 23, 1976 136
Focus on Governmental Affairs (Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.)—January 1976 137
District of Columbia Dateline (American Association of School Administrators)—January 1976 138
Baptist Standard—December 10, 1975 139
AFL-CIO News—December 6, 1975 140
American Opinion—December 1975 141
Memorandum to all minority members of the House Committee on Education and Labor from Martin L. LaVor, senior legislative associate 158
Interreligious statement on the Child and Family Services bill 161
Washington Report (UAW)—November 24, 1975 163
Position paper on comprehensive child care by the National Women's Political Caucus 164
Education Daily—November 21, 1975 167

Page

Statement of Representative Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., regarding allegations in the unsigned flyer 171

Statements of Members of Congress in response to the campaign against the Child and Family Services bill:

- Hon. Gillis W. Long of Louisiana 189
- Hon. Jacob K. Javits of New York 190
- Hon. Bob Wilson of California 191
- Hon. David F. Emery of Maine 192
- Hon. Spark M. Matsunaga of Hawaii 193
- Hon. Frank E. Moss of Utah 194
- Hon. Bud Shuster of Pennsylvania 195
- Hon. Thad Cochran of Mississippi 198
- Hon. Jack Edwards of Alabama 199
- Hon. Clifford P. Hansen of Wyoming 200
- Hon. James Abourezk of South Dakota 201
- Hon. Harold E. Ford of Tennessee 202
- Hon. Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota 205
- Hon. James J. Florio of New Jersey 205
- Hon. John Brademas of Indiana 207

A selection of versions of the original flyer 211

TEXT OF THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, H.R. 2966

94th CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 2966

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 6, 1975

Mr. Brademas (for himself, Ms. Mink, Mr. Bell, Ms. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Perkins Mr. Meeds, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Esch, Mr. Benitez, Mr. Pressler, Mr. Clay, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Dent, Mr. Dominick V. Daniels, and Mr. Beard of Rhode Island) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To provide for services to children and their families, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child and Family Services Act".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children;

(2) child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services, with a view toward offering families the options they believe to be most appropriate for their particular needs;

(3) although there have been increased services for children of working mothers and single parents and although Headstart and similar programs have provided supplemental educational and other services for children, such services have not been made available to families to the extent that parents consider necessary; there are many parents who are working full or part time without adequate arrangements for their children, and there are many children whose families lack sufficient resources to obtain adequate health, nutritional, educational, and other services;

(4) it is essential that the planning and operation of programs be undertaken as a partnership of parents, community, private agencies and State and local government with appropriate supportive assistance from the Federal Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those pre-school children and families with the greatest need, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decision-making at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served and other individuals and organizations in the community interested in child and family service (making the best possible use of public and private resources), through a partnership of parents, State and local government, and the Federal Government, building upon the experience and success of Headstart and other existing programs.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 3. (a) For the purpose of providing training, technical assistance, planning, and such other activities as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to plan for the implementation of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, to be allocated as prescribed in section 103.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, except that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for either fiscal year, unless funds appropriated to carry out part A of the Headstart-Follow Through Act for such year, or for any successor program are at least equal to the greater of (1) the amount appropriated to carry out such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, or (2) the amount appropriated to carry out such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976. Any such amounts appropriated for a fiscal year which are not obligated at the end of such fiscal year shall remain available for obligation until expended.

FORWARD FUNDING

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this Act, such funding for grants, contracts, or other payments under this Act is authorized to be included in the appropriations Acts for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which it shall be available for obligation.

(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

TITLE I—CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES; SPECIAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary shall take all necessary action to coordinate child and family service programs under his jurisdiction. To this end, he shall establish and maintain within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Child and Family Services administered by a Director appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, which office shall assume the responsibility of the Office of Child Development and shall be the principal agency of the Department for the administration of this Act.

(b) A Child and Family Services Coordinating Council, consisting of the Director of the Office of Child and Family Services established under subsection (a) (who shall serve as chairperson), and representatives from the Federal agencies administering the Social Security Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and from the National Institute of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Community Services Administration, the Department of Labor, and other appropriate agencies, shall meet on a regular basis, as they may deem necessary, in order to assure coordination of child and family service activities under their respective jurisdictions so as to assure—

(1) maximum use of available resources through the prevention of duplication of activities;

(2) a division of labor, insofar as is compatible with the purposes of each of the agencies or authorities specified in this paragraph, to assure maximum progress toward the achievement of the purposes of this Act;

(3) the establishment and maintenance of procedures to insure that each office or agency of the Federal Government conducting child and family services and related activities is aware of the administrative actions of other offices or agencies with respect to the provision of financial assistance to eligible applicants; and

(4) recommendation of priorities for federally funded research and development activities related to the purposes of this Act.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Office of Child and Family Services, shall provide financial assistance for carrying out child and family service programs for children and their families under this title to prime sponsors (including educational agencies) and to other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations pursuant to applications and plans approved in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds available for this title may be used (in accordance with approved applications and plans) for the following services and activities:

(1) planning and developing child and family service programs;

(2) establishing, maintaining, and operating child and family service programs, which may include—

(A) part-day or full-day child care programs, in the child's own home, in group homes, or in other child care facilities, which provide educational, health, nutritional, and social services directed toward enabling children participating in the program to attain their maximum potential;

(B) other health, social, recreational, and educational programs designed to meet the special needs of children and families including before- and after-school and summer programs; school services, and education, and consultation for parents, other family members functioning in the capacity of parents, youth, and prospective and expectant parents who request assistance in meeting the needs of their children;

(C) social services including information, consultation and referral, to families that request such services to help them determine the appropriateness of child and family services and the possibility of alternative plans;

(D) (i) prenatal and other medical care, including services to expectant mothers who cannot afford such services, designed to help reduce malnutrition, infant and maternal mortality, and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions, and (ii) post partum and other medical services to recent mothers;

(E) programs designed (i) to meet the special needs of ethnic groups, including minority groups, Indian, and migrant children, as well as children from families with special language needs, and (ii) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural backgrounds of ethnic groups including minority groups which belong to their communities and the role of members of such groups in the history and cultural development of the Nation and the region in which they reside;

(F) food and nutritional services;

(G) diagnosis, identification, and treatment of visual, hearing, speech, medical, dental, nutritional, and other physical, mental, psychological, and emotional barriers to full participation in child and family service programs;

(H) special activities designed to identify and ameliorate identified physical, mental, and emotional handicaps and special learning disabilities as an incorporated part of programs conducted under this title;

(I) programs designed to extend child and family service gains (particularly parent participation) into kindergarten and early primary grades, in cooperation with local educational agencies;

(J) other such services and activities as the Secretary deems appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act;

(3) rental, lease or lease-purchase, mortgage amortization payments, remodeling, renovation, alteration, acquisition and maintenance of necessary equipment and supplies, and to the extent authorized in section 110, construction or acquisition of facilities, including mobile facilities;

(4) preservice and inservice education and training

for professional and paraprofessional personnel, including parents and volunteers, especially education and training for career development and advancement;

(5) staff and other administrative expenses of child and family service councils established and operated in accordance with section 105, and of project policy committees established and operated in accordance with section 107; and

(6) dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served to assure that parents are well informed of child and family service programs available to them and may participate in such programs.

(c) Assistance under this title shall be made only for a program which—

(1) provides for establishing and maintaining a parent policy committee, to be composed of parents of children served by such program, which shall directly participate in the development and operation of such program (as described in section 107),

(2) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information to assure that parents of children served by such program are fully informed of program activities, and

(3) provides for regular consultation with the parents of each child regarding their child or children's de-

velopment, with ample opportunity for such parents to observe and participate in their child's activities.

(d) Except for the priority provided in section 107, the Secretary shall, in reviewing applications for grants or loans for programs under this title, consider the following factors—

(1) the need for a child and family services program, as demonstrated by supporting information and data;

(2) any prior planning which has been done in the area; and

(3) the ability of the applicant to best serve the needs of children in the area.

Sec. 103. (a) (1) From the amounts available for planning and carrying out child and family service programs under this title, the Secretary shall reserve the following:

(A) not less than 10 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, which shall be made available for the purposes of section 102 (d) (2) (H) of this title (relating to special activities for handicapped children).

(B) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out this title as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children of migrant agricultural workers bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United

States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children of migrant agricultural workers on an equitable basis;

(C) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out this title as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children in Indian tribal organizations bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children in Indian tribal organizations on an equitable basis;

(D) not more than 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, which shall be made available under section 104 (e) (2) of this title (relating to model programs); and

(E) not less than 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, for the purposes of section 203 of this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall allocate the remainder of the amounts available for this title (except for funds made available under section 3 (c) of this Act) among the States, and within the States among local areas, so as to provide, to the extent practicable, for the geographical distribution of such remainder in such a manner that—

(A) 50 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of economically disadvantaged children in each State and local area, respectively;

(B) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children through age five in each State and local area, respectively; and

(C) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children of working mothers and single parents in each State and local area, respectively.

For the purposes of clauses (A), (B), and (C) of this paragraph, there shall be excluded those children who are counted under clauses (B) and (C) of subsection (a) (1) of this section.

(b) Not more than 5 per centum of the total funds apportioned for use within a State pursuant to subsection (a) (2) may be made available for grants to the State to carry out the provisions of section 108 of this title.

(c) Any portion of any apportionment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Secretary determines after notice to the States and local areas involved will not be required, for the period for which such apportionment is available, for carrying out programs under this title shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during such periods as the Secretary shall fix, to other States or local areas on an equitable basis, taking into account the original apportionments to the States and local areas. Any amount reapportioned to a State or local area under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its apportionment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d) In determining the numbers of children for purposes of allocating and apportioning funds under this section, the Secretary shall use the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(e) As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations and apportionments required by this section.

STATE AND LOCAL PRIME SPONSORS

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this section, a State, locality, or combination of localities meeting the requirements of this part may be designated by the Secretary as a prime sponsor for the purpose of entering into arrangements to carry out programs under this title, upon the approval by the Secretary of an application for prime sponsorship which—

(1) describes the prime sponsorship area to be served;

(2) demonstrates the applicant's capability of administering a child and family service program meeting the requirements of this title, including the coordination of delivery of services within the prime sponsorship area of other public agencies operating programs relating to child care necessary for efficient delivery of services under this Act;

(3) provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the non-Federal share requirements of the Act will be met;

(4) sets forth satisfactory provisions for establishing and maintaining a Child and Family Service Council which meets the requirements of section 104;

(5) provides that the prime sponsor shall be responsible for developing and preparing for each fiscal year a plan in accordance with section 106 and any modification thereof and for selecting or establishing an agency or agencies to administer and coordinate child and family service programs in the prime sponsorship area;

(6) sets forth arrangements under which the Child and Family Service Council will be responsible for approving child and family service plans, basic goals, policies, procedures, overall budget policies and project

funding, and the selection or establishment and annual renewal of any agency or agencies under paragraph (5) of this section and will be responsible for annual and ongoing evaluation of child and family service programs conducted in the prime sponsorship area according to criteria established by the Secretary;

(7) provides assurances that staff and other administrative expenses for the Child and Family Service Policy Committees will not exceed 5 per centum of the total cost of child and family service programs administered by the prime sponsors unless such per centum limitation is increased to give special consideration to initial cost in the first operational year, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe;

(b) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship application submitted by a locality which is a (1) city, (2) county, or (3) other unit of general local government, or by a combination of such localities, if he determines that the application so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive and effective child and family service programs in the area of such locality. In the event that the area under the jurisdiction of a unit of general local government described in clause (1), (2), or (3) of the preceding sentence includes any common geographical area with that covered by another such unit of general local government, the Secretary shall designate to serve such area the unit of general local government which he determines has the capability of more effectively carrying out the purposes of this part with respect to such area and which has submitted an application which meets the requirements of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care and family service programs in such area.

(c) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a State, except for areas in which local prime sponsors have been or will be otherwise designated pursuant to this section, if he determines that the State plan so submitted meets the requirements of this section and sets forth adequate arrangements for serving all geographical areas under its jurisdiction, and that the plan—

(1) meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out child and family services programs in each such area;

(2) divides those areas within the State for which no prime sponsor has been designated under subsection (c) of this section into local service areas, with due consideration in making such decisions being given to compactness, contiguity, and community of interest;

(3) provides—

(A) for establishing and maintaining with respect to each local service area a local program council composed so that (i) not less than half of the members who shall be chosen initially by parents who are recipients of federally assisted day care services, with equitable and appropriate consideration to parents selected by the parent members of Headstart policy committees where they exist, and at the earliest practicable time by the parent members of project policy committees, and (ii) the remainder shall be public members broadly representative of the general public, appointed by the chief executive officers or the governing bodies, as appropriate, of the units of general local government within the local program area;

(B) that the comprehensive child care and family service plan to be submitted by the State which affects each such area is developed and prepared with the full participation and approval of the appropriate local program council; and

(C) that contracts for the operation of programs through public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations shall be entered into only if previously approved by the local program council for the appropriate local service area; and

(4) contains assurances that any local program council may appeal directly to the Secretary whenever such council alleges that with respect to its portion of the child and family service plan the State has failed to comply with the provisions of such plan or the provisions of the Act.

(e) In addition to prime sponsors designated under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Secretary may fund directly:

(1) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation if he determines that such Indian tribe has the capacity to carry out child and family service programs in the area to be served;

(2) a public or private nonprofit agency, including but not limited to an educational agency or institution, a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, employer organization, labor union, or employee or labor-management organization, which submits a proposal:

(i) to provide child and family services in an area possessing a commonality of interest where no prime sponsor has been designated, or where the prime sponsor is found not to be satisfactorily implementing child and family service programs;

(ii) to provide child and family service programs on a year-round basis to children of migrant agricultural workers and their families; or

(iii) to carry out model programs especially designed to be responsive to the needs of economically disadvantaged, minority group, or bilingual children and their families.

(f) When any prime sponsor is maintaining a pattern or practice of discrimination against minority group children or economically disadvantaged children, the Secretary shall designate for prime sponsorship an alternative unit of government of public or private agency or organization in the area which will equitably serve minority group children and economically disadvantaged children.

(g) The Governor shall be given not less than thirty nor more than sixty days to review applications for prime sponsorship designation submitted by any applicant within the State other than the State, to offer recommendations to the applicant, and to submit comments to the Secretary.

(h) A prime sponsorship application submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior designation of a prime sponsor may be withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided (1) written notice of intention to disapprove such application, including a statement of the reasons therefor, (2) a reasonable time in which to submit corrective amendments to such application or undertake other necessary corrective action, and (3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

(i) (1) If any party is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action under subsection (h) with respect to the disapproval of its application submitted under this section or the withdrawal of its prime sponsorship designation, such party may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such party is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the

Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE COUNCILS

SEC. 105. (a) Each prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall establish and maintain a Child and Family Service Council composed of not less than ten members as follows—

(1) not less than half the members of such Council shall be parents of children served in programs under this Act chosen in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of this section;

(2) the remaining members shall be appointed by the prime sponsor, in consultation with the parent members described in paragraph (1) to be broadly representative of the general public, including representatives of private agencies and organizations concerned with or operating programs relating to child and family services and at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child and family services;

(3) at least one-third of the total membership of the Child and Family Service Council shall be persons who are economically disadvantaged. Each council shall select its own chairperson; and

(4) in establishing a Child Development and Family Service Council under this section, the prime sponsor shall give due consideration to the membership of child care and day care coordinating bodies then existing in the area to be served.

(b) In accordance with procedures which the Secretary shall establish pursuant to regulations, each prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall provide, with respect to the Child and Family Service Councils established and maintained by such prime sponsor, that—

(1) the parent members described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be democratically selected by parents as follows:

(A) in the case of councils established by prime sponsors which are States, by the parent members of local program councils established under section 104 (d) (3) ; and

(B) in the case of Councils established by prime sponsors other than States (and by States with respect to local program councils), initially by parents who are recipients of federally assisted child care services, with equitable and appropriate consideration to parents selected by the parent members of Headstart policy committees and, at the earliest practicable time, by the parent members of project policy committees established under section 107 (b) (2);

(2) the terms of office and any other policies and procedures of an organizational nature, including nomination and election procedures, are appropriate in accordance with the purposes of this Act;

(3) such Council shall be responsible for approving child and family service plans, basic goal, policies, procedures, overall budget policies and project funding, and the selection or establishment and annual renewal of an administering agency or agencies and will be responsible for annual and ongoing evaluation of child and family service programs according to criteria established by the Secretary; and

(4) such Council shall, upon its own initiative or upon request of a project applicant or any other party in interest, conduct public hearings before acting upon applications for financial assistance submitted by project applicants under this part.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PLANS

SEC. 106. (a) Financial assistance under this title may be provided by the Secretary for fiscal year 1975 and any subsequent fiscal year to a prime sponsor designated pursuant to section 104 only pursuant to a child and family service plan which is submitted by such prime sponsor and approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Any such plan shall set forth a program for providing child and family service in the prime sponsorship area which—

(1) provides that programs or services under this title shall be provided only for children whose parents request them;

(2) identifies child and family service needs and goals within the area and describes the purposes for which the financial assistance will be used, giving equitable consideration to the needs of children from each minority group and significant segment of the economically disadvantaged residing within the prime sponsorship area;

(3) meets the needs of children and families in the prime sponsorship area, to the extent that available funds can be reasonably expected to have an effective impact, with priority for services to children who have not attained six years of age;

(4) provides that programs receiving funds under section 3(b)) will give priority to providing services for economically disadvantaged children by reserving

not less than 65 per centum of such funds for the purpose of serving economically disadvantaged children;

(5) gives priority thereafter to providing services to children of working mothers and single parents not covered under paragraph (4);

(6) provides that, to the extent feasible, each program within the prime sponsorship area shall include children from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds;

(7) provides that no charge will be made with respect to any child who is economically disadvantaged, except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party;

(8) provides comprehensive services—

(A) to meet the special needs of minority group children and children of migrant agricultural workers with particular emphasis on the needs of children from bilingual families for the development of skills in English and in the other language spoken in the home, and

(B) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural background of minority groups within the prime sponsorship area;

(9) provides for direct parent participation in the conduct, overall direction, and evaluation of programs;

(10) provides that, insofar as possible, unemployed

or low-income persons residing in communities being served by such projects will be employed therein, including in-home and part-time employment and opportunities for training and career development, provided that no person will be denied employment in any program solely on the grounds that such person fails to meet State or local teacher certification standards;

(11) includes a career development plan for paraprofessional and professional training, education, and advancement on a career ladder;

(12) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and other interested persons in the community are fully informed of the activities of the prime sponsor, Child and Family Service Council, project applicants, and project policy committees;

(13) sets forth provisions describing any arrangements for the delegation, under the supervision of the Child and Family Service Council, to public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, of responsibilities for the delivery of programs, services, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this Act or for planning or evaluation services to be made available with respect to programs under this Act;

(14) provides procedures for the approval of project applications submitted in accordance with section 107, including procedures for priority consideration of applications submitted by public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations with ongoing child development programs;

(15) provides, in the case of a prime sponsor located within or adjacent to a metropolitan area, for coordination with other prime sponsors located within such metropolitan area, and arrangements for cooperative funding where appropriate, and particularly for such coordination where appropriate to meet the needs of children of parents working or participating in training or otherwise occupied during the day within a prime sponsorship area other than that in which they reside;

(16) provides for coordination of other child care and related programs (including those relating to manpower training and employment) within the prime sponsorship area with the programs assisted under this Act, including procedures and mechanisms to provide continuity between programs for preschool and elementary school children;

(17) provides for such monitoring and evaluation procedures including licensing, inspection, and enforcement activities as may be necessary to assure that pro-

grams in the prime sponsorship area funded under this Act meet the applicable Federal standards as prescribed in section 201 of this Act; and

(18) provides for such fiscal control and funding accounting procedures as the Secretary may prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the prime sponsor; and

(19) provides, to the extent practicable, for the use of financial assistance and services available from State and local government, Federal sources other than those provided in this Act, and private charitable sources with respect to activities and services under the plan.

(c) No child and family service plan or modification thereof submitted by a prime sponsor under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless he determines, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe, that—

(1) the educational agency for the area to be served and other appropriate educational and training agencies and institutions have had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(2) each community action agency or single-purpose Headstart agency in the area to be served respon-

sible for the administration of programs under this part or part A of the Headstart-Follow Through Act has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(3) in the case of a plan submitted by a prime sponsor other than the State, the Governor of that State or the State Child and Family Service Council has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary.

(d) A comprehensive child and family service plan submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior approval withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided—

(1) written notice of intention to disapprove such plan, including a statement of the reasons therefor,

(2) a reasonable time to submit corrective amendments to such plan or undertake other necessary corrective action, and

(3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Sec. 107. (a) Funds may be provided by the prime sponsor for carrying out any program under such prime sponsor's comprehensive child and family service plan only to a qualified public or private agency or organization, including but not limited to an educational agency or institution, a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, organization interested in child care, employer or business organization, labor union, or employee or labor management organization.

(b) Financial assistance under this title may be provided to a project applicant for any fiscal year only pursuant to a project application which is submitted to the Child and Family Service Council by a public or private agency and which—

(1) describes the project, identifies the children and families it is designed to serve, and provides for the necessary such comprehensive services.

(2) provides for establishing and maintaining a parent policy committee composed of not less than ten members as follows—

(A) not less than half of the members of each such committee shall be parents of children served by such project, democratically selected by parents of children served by the project, and

(B) the remaining members of each such committee shall consist of (i) persons who are representative of the community and who are approved by the parent members, and (ii) at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child care, child health, child welfare, or other child care services, except that the Secretary may waive the requirement of this clause where he determines, in accordance with regulations that such persons are not available to the area to be served;

(3) provides for direct participation of such parent policy committee in the development and preparation of project applications under this title;

(4) assures that the parent policy committee shall have responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions, and procedures for the project applicant, and for planning, overall conduct, personnel, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and direction and evaluation of projects, including approval of the project director and any project applications and modifications thereof;

(5) makes adequate provision for training and other administrative expenses of such parent policy committee (including necessary expenses to enable low-income members to participate in committee meetings);

(6) assures that services shall be provided without charge to any child who is economically disadvantaged

except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party;

(7) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and interested persons are fully informed of project activities;

(8) provides opportunities for the direct participation of parents, older siblings, and other family members in the daily activities of the programs in which their children are enrolled;

(9) assures, to the extent practicable, employment of paraprofessional aides and use of volunteers, especially parents, older children, students, older persons, and persons preparing for careers in child development and family service programs;

(10) assures that children will in no case be excluded from the programs operated pursuant to this title because of their participation in nonpublic preschool or school programs or because of the intention of their parents to enroll them in nonpublic schools when they attain school age;

(11) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the prime sponsor shall prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds.

(c) A project application may be approved by a prime sponsor upon its determination that such application meets the requirements of this section and that the programs provided for therein will otherwise further the objectives and satisfy the appropriate provisions of the prime sponsor's comprehensive child and family service plan as approved pursuant to section 106.

(d) A project application from a public or private agency seeking funds under section 104 (d) shall be submitted directly to the Secretary, and may be approved by the Secretary upon his determination that it meets the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

(e) A prime sponsor may disapprove a project application only if it provides to the project applicant a written statement of the reasons therefor. Such project applicant may submit an appeal to the Secretary requesting the direct approval of such application or modification thereof. Any such appeal shall include such comments, including the project applicant's response to the prime sponsor's statement of reasons for disapproval, as the project applicant may deem appropriate or as the Secretary may require.

SPECIAL GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 108. (a) Upon application submitted by any State, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for use by such State for carrying out activities for the purposes of—

(1) establishing a child and family services information program, in order to improve their quality and availability, and improve the accessibility of such services to parents who need them;

(2) identifying child and family service goals and needs within the State;

(3) coordinating all State child and family services, and encouraging the cooperation and participation of State agencies in providing such services, including health, family planning, mental health, education, nutrition, and family, social and rehabilitative services where requested by appropriate prime sponsors in the development and implementation of comprehensive child and family service plans;

(4) encouraging the full use of resources and facilities for child and family service programs within the State;

(5) developing, enforcing, and assessing State codes for licensing child and family service facilities within the State;

(6) assisting public and private agencies and organizations in the acquisition or improvement of facilities for child and family service programs;

(7) assisting in the establishment of Child and Family Service Councils and strengthening the capa-

bility of such Councils to effectively plan, supervise, coordinate, monitor, and evaluate child and family service programs;

(8) developing information useful in reviewing prime sponsorship applications under section 104 and of comprehensive child and family service plans under section 106.

(b) In order to receive funds under this section, a State shall establish a Child and Family Service Council as prescribed in section 104 (a).

(c) Funds received by the State under this section shall be in addition to any funds such State may receive under this title pursuant to an approved prime sponsorship application and comprehensive child and family service plan.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAMS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION

SEC. 109. (a) Applications for financial assistance for projects including construction or acquisition may be approved only if the prime sponsor, or the Secretary in cases of applications submitted for his approval, determines that construction or acquisition of such facilities is essential to the provision of adequate child care services, and that rental, lease, or lease-purchase, remodeling, or renovation of adequate facilities is not practicable.

(b) If any facility assisted under this title shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds unless the Secretary determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction, remodeling, renovation, or alteration projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(d) In the case of loans for construction, the Secretary shall prescribe the interest rate and the period within which such loan shall be repaid, but such interest rate shall not be less than 3 per centum per annum and the period within which such loan is to be repaid shall not be more than twenty-five years.

(e) The Federal assistance for construction, remodeling, renovation, alteration, or acquisition of facilities, may be in the form of grants or loans. Repayment of loans shall, to the extent required by the Secretary, be returned to the prime sponsor from whose financial assistance the loan was made, or used for additional loans or grants under this title. Not more than 15 per centum of the total financial assistance provided to a prime sponsor under this title shall be used for construction of facilities, with no more than 7½ per centum of such assistance usable for grants for construction. Financial assistance for construction or acquisition of facilities pursuant to this Act shall be available only to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations.

USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PROGRAMS

SEC. 110. (a) The Secretary, after consultation with other appropriate officials of the Federal Government, shall within eighteen months after enactment of this Act report to the Congress with respect to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by Federal departments, agencies, and independent authorities could be made available to public and private agencies and organizations, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child and family service programs under this title during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with his recommendations (including recommendations for changes in legislation) or proposed actions for such use.

(b) The Secretary may require, as a condition to the receipt of assistance under this title, that any prime sponsor under this title agree to conduct a review and provide the Secretary with a report as to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by such prime sponsor, or by other agencies in the prime sponsorship area, could be made available, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child and family service programs under this title during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with the prime sponsor's proposed actions for such use.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 111. (a) In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall pay from the applicable allocation or apportionment under section 103 the Federal share of the costs of programs, services, and activities, in accordance with plans or applications which have been approved as provided in this title. In making such payment to any prime sponsor, the Secretary shall include in such costs an amount for staff and other administrative expenses for the Child and Family Service Councils and for parent policy committees, consistent with limitations contained in this title.

(b) The Secretary shall pay from funds appropriated under section 3 (a) for fiscal year 1976 an amount equal to 100 per centum of the cost of planning, training, and technical assistance.

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, the Secretary shall pay from funds appropriated under section 3 (b) for fiscal year 1977 an amount not in excess of 90 per centum and from funds appropriated under section 3 (b) for fiscal year 1978 and subsequent years an amount not to exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out programs, services, and activities under this title. The Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, approve assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines that such action is required to provide adequately for the child and family service needs of economically disadvantaged children.

(2) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child and family service programs for children of migrant agricultural workers under this title.

(3) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child and family

service programs for children in Indian tribal organizations under this title.

(c) The non-Federal share of the costs of programs assisted under this title may be provided through public or private funds and may be in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities (or portions thereof that are used for program purposes), reasonably evaluated, or union or employer contributions. Fees collected for services shall not be used for the non-Federal share, but shall be used by the prime sponsor to improve and expand programs under the comprehensive child development and family service plan.

(d) If, with respect to any fiscal year, a prime sponsor or project applicant provides non-Federal contributions or any program, service, or activity exceeding its requirements, such excess may be applied toward meeting the requirements, for such contributions for the subsequent fiscal year under this title.

(e) No State or unit of general local government shall reduce its expenditures for child development or child care programs by reason of assistance under this title.

TITLE II—STANDARDS AND EVALUATIONS

FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR CHILD CARE

SEC. 201. (a) (1) Within six months after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after consultation with other Federal agencies and with the approval of the committee established pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child care services under this or any other Federal Act, to be known as the Federal Standards for Child Care.

(2) Such standards shall replace but shall be consistent with the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements as approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor on September 23, 1968. The 1968 requirements will continue to apply to all applicable programs until program standards required by subsection (a) are promulgated.

(3) Not less than sixty days prior to implementation of program standards pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary shall submit such proposed program standards to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. Upon majority vote of either committee within such sixty days disapproving such proposed program standards, such standards shall not take effect.

(b) The Secretary shall establish policies and procedures, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, to assure that all programs and projects assisted under this Act address, on a continuing basis, the individual needs of and the appropriateness of child development and family service for the very young and other children served—

(1) any program or project providing care outside the home for very young children shall be reviewed and evaluated periodically and frequently by the Secretary, to insure that it meets the highest standards of quality; and the Secretary may reserve such funds as he deems necessary from funds available under this Act for the purpose of evaluation, by appropriate persons, of programs under this Act in order to insure compliance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(2) no program or project described in clause (1) of this subsection shall be approved for assistance under this Act unless it is specifically authorized and approved by the Secretary.

(c) (1) Upon determination that a prime sponsor or project is in violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall give immediate public notice of such determination to such prime sponsor or project and, if such violation or violations have not been corrected, shall commence action within ninety days of such determination to withhold funds under section 204.

(2) Upon determination that a project is in violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the prime

sponsor shall give immediate notice of such determination to such project and, if such violation or violations have not been corrected, shall commence action within ninety days of such determination to withhold funds under section 204.

(c) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after enactment of this Act, appoint a Special Committee on Federal Standards for Child Care, which shall include parents of children enrolled in Headstart and child care programs, representatives of public and private agencies and organizations administering such programs, specialists, and other public and private providers of child and family services, individuals engaged in licensing activities, and others interested in services for children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children participating in programs conducted under title I of this Act and part A of the Headstart-Follow Through Act and title IV-A of the Social Security Act, or other public programs providing child and family services. Such committee shall participate in the development of Federal Standards for child care and modifications thereof as provided in subsection (a).

(d) In no event shall any prime sponsor or program or project receiving assistance under this Act reduce the quality of services provided under this Act below the standards established in this section.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM CODE FOR FACILITIES

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, appoint a special committee to develop a uniform minimum code for facilities, to be used in licensing child and family services facilities. Such standards shall deal principally with these matters essential to the health, safety, and physical comfort of the children and the relationship of such matters to the Federal Standards for child care developed under section 201.

(b) The special committee appointed under this section shall include parents of children enrolled in comprehensive child services programs and representatives of State and local licensing agencies, public health officials, fire prevention officials, the construction industry and unions, public and private agencies or organizations administering comprehensive child services programs, and national agencies or organizations interested in services for children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children enrolled in programs conducted under this title, part A of the Headstart-Follow Through Act, and title IV of the Social Security Act.

(c) Within six months of its appointment, the special committee shall complete a proposed uniform code and shall hold public hearings on the proposed code prior to submitting its final recommendation to the Secretary for his approval.

(d) The Secretary must approve the code as a whole or secure the concurrence of the special committee to changes therein, and, upon approval, such standards shall be applicable to all facilities receiving Federal financial assistance under this Act or in which programs receiving such Federal financial assistance are operated; and the Secretary shall also distribute such standards and urge their adoption by States and local governments. The Secretary may from time to time modify the uniform code for facilities in accordance with the procedures described in subsections (a) through (d).

PROGRAM MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall provide, through the Office of Child and Family Services, for regular and periodic monitoring of programs under this Act to assure compliance with the child care standards and other requirements of this Act, and shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of sufficient trained staff in such office to accomplish the purpose of this section.

WITHHOLDING OF GRANTS

SEC. 204. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to any prime sponsor, or project applicant, finds—

(1) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the plan

of any such prime sponsor approved under section 106; or

(2) that there has been a failure to comply with applicable standards pursuant to section 201; or

(3) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the application of any such project applicant approved pursuant to section 107; or

(4) that in the operation of any plan, program, or project carried out by any such prime sponsor, or project applicant or other recipient of financial assistance under this Act there is a failure to comply substantially with any applicable provision of this Act or regulation promulgated thereunder;

the Secretary shall notify such prime sponsor, project applicant, or other recipient of his findings and that no further payments may be made to such sponsor, project applicant, or other recipient under this Act (or in the Secretary's discretion that any such prime sponsor shall not make further payments under this Act to specified project applicants affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or that the noncompliance will be promptly corrected. The Secretary may authorize the continuation of payments with respect to any project assisted under this Act which is being carried out pursuant to such plan or application and which is not involved in any noncompliance.

EVALUATION

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall make an evaluation of Federal involvement in child and family services, which shall include—

(1) enumeration and description of all Federal activities which affect child and family service programs;

(2) analysis of expenditures of Federal funds for such activities and services;

(3) determination of the effectiveness of such activities and services;

(4) the extent to which preschool, minority group, and economically disadvantaged children and their parents have participated in programs under this Act; and

(5) such recommendations to Congress as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

(b) The results of the evaluation required by subsection (a) of this section shall be reported to Congress not later than two years after enactment of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall establish such procedures as may be necessary to conduct an annual evaluation of Federal involvement in child and family services programs, and shall report the results to each such evaluation to Congress.

(d) Prime sponsors and project applicants assisted under this Act and departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall, upon request by the Secretary or the Comptroller General of the United States make available, consistent with other provisions of law, such information as the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of making the evaluation required under subsection (c) of this section, or the Comptroller General determines is necessary for an independent evaluation.

(e) The Secretary may enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) The Secretary shall reserve for the purposes of this section not less than 1 per centum, but not more than 2 per centum, of the amounts available under section 3 (b) of this Act for any fiscal year.

TITLE III—FACILITIES AND RESEARCH FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS

MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR COMPREHENSIVE CHILD SERVICES FACILITIES

SEC. 301. (a) It is the purpose of this section to assist and encourage the provision of urgently needed facilities for child care and comprehensive child services programs.

(b) For the purpose of this section—

(1) The term "child and family services facility"

means a facility of a public or private profit or nonprofit agency or organization, licensed or regulated by the State (or, if there is no State law providing for such licensing and regulation by the State, by the municipality or other political subdivision in which the facility is located), for the provision of comprehensive child services programs.

(2) The terms "mortgage", "mortgagor", "mortgagee", "maturity date", and "State" shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207 of the National Housing Act.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on such mortgage during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and make commitments for insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon.

(d) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new child and family services facility, including equipment to be used in its operation, subject to the following conditions.

(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor, approved by the Secretary, who shall demonstrate ability successfully to operate one or more child care or child and family services programs. The Secretary may in his discretion require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to minimum charges and methods of financing, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Secretary may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Secretary under the insurance.

(2) The mortgagor shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $250,000 and not to exceed 90 per centum of the estimated replacement cost of the property or project (including equipment replacement cost of the property or project, including equipment to be used in the operation of the facility) when the proposed improvements are completed and the equipment is installed.

(3) The mortgage shall—

(A) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Secretary shall prescribe, and

(B) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charges, if any) at not to exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding at any time as the Secretary finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

(4) The Secretary shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he has determined that the comprehensive child services facility to be covered by the mortgage will be in compliance with the Uniform Code for Facilities approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 202 of this Act.

(5) The Secretary shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he determines the facility is consistent with and will not hinder the program of child and family services under title I of this Act.

(e) The Secretary shall fix and collect premium charges for the insurance of mortgages under this section which shall be payable annually in advance by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures of the Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund (established by subsection (h)) issued at par plus accrued interest. In the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any one time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. In addition to the premium charge herein provided for, the Secretary is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for the appraisal of a property or project during construction; but such charges for appraisal and inspection shall not aggregate more than 1 per centum of the original principal fee amount of the mortgage.

(f) The Secretary may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

(g) (1) The Secretary shall have the same functions, powers, and duties (insofar as applicable) with respect to the insurance of mortgages under this section as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has with respect to the insurance of mortgages under title II of the National Housing Act.

(2) The provisions of subsections (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 of the National Housing Act shall apply to mortgages insured under this section; except that, for purposes of their application with respect to such mortgages, all references in such provisions

to the General Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund, and all references in such provisions to "Secretary" shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(h) (1) There is hereby created a Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund for carrying out all the insurance provisions of this section. All mortgages insured under this section shall be insured under and by the obligation of the fund.

(2) The general expenses of the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to mortgages insured under this section may be charged to the fund.

(3) Moneys in the fund not needed for the current operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to mortgages insured under this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Secretary may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued as obligations of the fund. Such purchases shall be made at

a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

(4) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage under this section, the receipts derived from property covered by such mortgages and from any claims, debts, contracts, property, and security assigned to the Secretary in connection therewith, and all earnings on the assets of the fund, shall be credited to the fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures which are the obligation of the fund, cash insurance payments and adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired, in connection with mortgages insured under this section, shall be charged to the fund.

(5) There are authorized to be appropriated to provide initial capital for the fund, and to assure the soundness of the fund thereafter, such sums as may be necessary.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program of research and demonstration projects, which shall include but not be limited to—

(1) research to develop techniques to measure and

evaluate child and family services, and to develop standards to evaluate professional and paraprofessional child and family service personnel;

(2) research to test preschool programs emphasizing reading and reading readiness;

(3) preventive medicine and techniques and technology, including multiphasic screening and testing, to improve the early diagnosis and treatment of diseases and learning disabilities of pre-school children;

(4) research to test alternative methods of providing child and family service;

(5) evaluation of research findings and the development of these findings and the effective application thereof;

(6) dissemination and application of research and development efforts and demonstration projects to child and family service and related programs and early childhood education, using regional demonstration centers and advisory services where feasible;

(7) production of informational systems and other resources necessary to support the activities authorized by this Act;

(8) developing methods of determining the needs of individual children in particular areas such as education, nutrition, and medical services, so as to permit the

modification of programs to fit the needs of individual children; and

(9) a study of the need on a nationwide basis for child and family services programs and of the resources, including personnel, which are available to meet this need.

(b) In order to carry out the program provided for in this section, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts or other arrangements with public or private agencies (including other Government agencies), organizations, institutions, and individuals.

(c) (1) The Secretary shall coordinate, through the Office of Child and Family Services established under section 101 (a), all child and family services research, training, and development efforts conducted within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and, to the extent feasible, by other agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(2) Funds available to any Federal department or agency for the purposes of this title shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Secretary for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and the funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Secretary through the Office of Child and

Family Services established under section 101(a), for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

(d) The Secretary shall conduct special demonstration, and model programs, which demonstration, and model programs shall be subject to the fullest extent practicable to each of the requirements with respect to project applications under section 107.

(e) The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than September 1, 1976, summarizing his activities and accomplishments under this section during the preceding fiscal year and the grants, contracts, or other arrangements entered into and making such recommendations (including recommendations for legislation) as he may deem appropriate.

TITLE IV—TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

TRAINING

SEC. 401. Congress recognizes that one of the major barriers hindering the development of quality child services at the present time is the lack of sufficiently trained and prepared professional and paraprofessional staff; and the continued entry of mothers of young children into full-time employment outside the home, will, in the future, place an intolerable strain on the already limited numbers of personnel qualified for work in early childhood programs; that the development of quality programs depends, therefore, on the availability of trained personnel in far greater numbers than present training programs can respond to; and finally, that parents can be helped effectively to use child service methods with their own children that will lessen or prevent the need for compensatory education programs for older children.

SEC. 402. It is the purpose of this title to respond to the demonstrated need for child services personnel in the 1970's; by stimulating the development of sufficient training and educational programs in every State and region of the United States to assure an adequate supply of personnel to meet staffing requirements.

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, State and local agencies, State and local educational agencies, private organizations and agencies engaged in teacher training, teacher training institutions, national child care organizations, and producers of television programing, for the purpose of establishing, developing, or upgrading early childhood personnel training programs which shall include, but shall not be limited to, the development of programs to—

(A) provide postgraduate level training for teachers of professional and paraprofessional early childhood personnel and for teachers of teachers of such personnel;

(B) attract and recruit personnel, both male and female, including students and older Americans, to training for and subsequent employment in child care programs;

(C) retrain personnel prepared for and/or experienced in education at levels other than early childhood so as to enable them to function effectively in early childhood programs;

(D) provide preservice and inservice training of professional and paraprofessional personnel for teaching, management and supervisory, and administrative posts in early childhood programs, including the training and certification of Child Development Associates;

(E) help parents and high school students understand and practice sound child care techniques;

(F) develop educational television programs and other materials for training early childhood personnel, parents, and high school students;

(G) develop and refine certification criteria and techniques for professional and paraprofessional early childhood personnel.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 405. Section 501 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "There is additionally authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for each fiscal year thereafter for programs and projects under this part to train or retrain professional personnel for comprehensive child services programs, and the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for each fiscal year thereafter, for programs and projects under this part to train or retrain nonprofessional personnel for such programs.".

SEC. 406. Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act is amended as follows, by adding after the word "nonprofit" each time it occurs the phrase "comprehensive child services program," by striking out "and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(C) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as so determined by regulations) of service as a full-time teacher in public or private nonprofit comprehensive child services programs or in any such programs operating under authority of title I of the Child and Family Services Act, and (D)".

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is authorized to award grants to individuals employed in comprehensive child services programs operating under the authority of title I of this Act and to such programs for the purposes of meeting the costs of ongoing inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel, including volunteers, to be conducted by an agency carrying on a child and family services program by a community or higher education institution, or by a combination thereof.

SEC. 408. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of section 403 the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1976 and for each succeeding fiscal year.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 501. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa,

the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(3) "child and family service programs" means programs on a full-day or part-day basis which provide or arrange for the provision of the educational, nutritional, health, and other services needed to provide the opportunity for children to attain their full potential, including services to other family members;

(4) "children" means individuals who have not attained the age of fifteen;

(5) "economically disadvantaged children" means any children of a family having an annual income below the lower living standard budget (adjusted for regional and metropolitan, urban, and rural differences, and family size), as determined annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at the Department of Labor;

(6) "handicapped children" includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services;

(7) "program" includes any program, service, or activity, which is conducted full- or part-time in the home, in schools, or in child care facilities;

(8) "parent" means any person who has primary day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(9) "single parent" means any person who has sole day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(10) "working mother" means any mother who needs child or family service in order to undertake or continue full- or part-time employment, training, or education outside the home;

(11) "minority group" includes, but is not limited to, persons who are Negro, American Indian, Spanish-surnamed American, Portuguese, or Oriental, and, as determined by the Secretary, children who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English and who, as a result of language barriers, may need special assistance, and, for the purpose of this paragraph, "Spanish-surnamed Americans" includes, but is not limited to, persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish origin or ancestry;

(12) "bilingual" includes, but is not limited to persons who are Spanish-surnamed Americans, American Indian, Oriental, Portuguese, or others who have learned during childhood to speak the language of the minority group of which they are members and who, as a result of language barriers, may need special assistance;

(13) "local educational agency" means any such

agency as defined in section 801 (f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(14) "unit of general local government" means any political subdivision of a State having general governmental powers.

NUTRITION SERVICES

SEC. 502. In accordance with the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish procedures to assure that adequate nutrition services will be provided in child and family services programs under this Act. Such services shall make use of the special food service program for children as defined under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, to the fullest extent appropriate and consistent with the provisions of such Acts.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless the grant, contract, or agreement with respect to such program specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any program, program participant, or any applicant for participation in such program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation or beliefs.

(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act. The Secretary shall enforce the provisions of the preceding sentence in accordance with section 602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken by the Secretary to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if that person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act.

(c) The Secretary may make such grants, contracts, or agreements, establish such procedures, policies, rules, and regulations and make such payments in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including necessary adjustments in payments on account of overpayments or underpayments. Subject to the provisions of section 504, the Secretary may also withhold funds otherwise payable under this Act in order to recover any amounts expended in the current or immediately prior fiscal year in violation of any provision of this Act on any term or condition of assistance under this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program, service, or activity under this Act unless he determines that persons employed thereunder, other than persons who serve without compensation, shall be paid wages which shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of—

(1) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), if section 6(a)(1) of such Act applied to the participant and if he were not exempt under section 13 thereof;

(2) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment; or

(3) the prevailing rates of pay for persons employed in similar occupations by the same employer.

(e) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless he determines that no funds will be used for and no person will be employed under the program in the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is for use for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship.

SPECIAL PROHIBITIONS AND PROTECTIONS

SEC. 504. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law.

(b) The Secretary is directed to establish appropriate procedures to insure that no child shall be the subject of any research or experimentation under this Act unless the parent or guardian of such child informed of such research or experimentation and is given an opportunity as a right to except such child therefrom.

(c) A child participating in a program assisted under this Act shall not undergo medical or psychological examination, experimentation or research, immunization (except to the extent necessary to protect the public from epidemics of contagious diseases or in the case of medical emergencies where parental consent cannot be readily obtained), or treatment without the written permission of his parent or guardian based upon full understanding of the procedures and possible consequences.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

SEC. 505. Applications for designation as prime sponsors, comprehensive child development plans, project applications, and all written material pertaining thereto shall be made readily available without charge to the public by the prime sponsor, the applicant, and the Secretary.

COORDINATION WITH EXISTING AUTHORITY

SEC. 506. (a) After consultation with the head of any agency of the Federal Government immediately responsible for providing Federal assistance for child and family services, and related programs, including title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, part B of the Headstart-Follow Through Act, title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and titles IV and VI of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish regulations to assure the coordination of all such programs with the programs assisted under this Act.

(b) The day care services furnished as a part of the child care services furnished under a State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, or as a part of the child welfare services furnished under a State plan developed as provided in part B of such title, shall be day care services made available under title I of this Act, and such services shall be deemed to meet the requirements of section 422 (a) (1) (C) of the Social Security Act. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations and make such arrangements as may be necessary or appropriate to insure that suitable child and family services programs under this Act are available for children receiving aid or services under State plans approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act and State plans developed as provided in part B of such title to the extent that such programs are required for the administration of such plans and the achievement of their objectives, and that there is effective coordination between the comprehensive child services programs under this Act and the programs of aid and services under such title IV.

(c) (1) Section 203 (j) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "or civil defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "civil defense, or the operation of child care facilities".

(2) Section 203 (j) (3) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out, in the first sentence, "or public health" and inserting in lieu thereof "public health, or the operation of child care facilities";

(B) by inserting after "handicapped," in clause (A) and clause (B) of the first sentence the following: "child care facilities"; and

(C) by inserting after "public health purposes" and the second sentence, the following: ", or for the operation of child care facilities,"

ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 507. In carrying out the purposes and provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to accept and use funds appropriated to carry out other provisions of Federal law if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

ANONYMOUS FLYER ATTACKING CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

RAISING CHILDREN--GOVERNMENT'S OR PARENT'S RIGHT?

There is before Congress legislation known as the Child & Family Service Act of 1975 (Senate: S626 & House: HR2966). If passed it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the Government.

CHILD ADVOCACY CLAUSE

In the Congressional Record we read: "If, in the judgement of those who are in charge of such a program (the State by way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a "specialist" appointed by the government) would enter the home and direct the education, even with the home. And, if the parent would object, the authority in the home would, De Facto, be transferred to these advocated."

CHARTER OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CIVIL LIBERTIES is becoming a part of this Child Development Act. Following are four of the several items proposed in this charter. They can be found on page 44138 of the Congressional Record.

(1) "All Children have the right of protection from, and compensation for the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds." (Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back to you with a civil suit.)

(2) "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority." The question was asked, by way of example, what do you mean by the fact "excessive claim", and the example was given, "If the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it."

(3) "Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination." That means that you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. That also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, or any ideas, about God.

(4) "Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of reprisals." This speaks for itself.

This piece of legislation was vetoed in 1971, but it is back on the floor of Congress and now has the votes to pass. It is our obligation to tell our legislators: Senators Bayh and Hartke & our U.S. Representatives what we think of this legislation. Only our complaints can change their minds. They take your vote seriously. Take the trouble to write or suffer the consequences of your silence.

CAN THE GOVERNMENT TAKE AWAY YOUR CHILDREN?

Comprehensive child development, the SOVIET-style system of communal child rearing which almost became law in this country in 1971 is once again being pushed through Congress. The current bills HR.2966 (House of Representatives) and S626 (Senate), are virtually identical to the original act passed in 1971, but fortunately vetoed by the then president, Nixon. Now it is known as the CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES ACT of 1975 and any changes are merely cosmetic.

In vetoing the original bill which would have removed children from their parent's instruction shortly after birth, Mr. Nixon said that it would weaken the American family by committing "the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family oriented approach."

We are in serious danger of "Sovietizing" the education of our children if we let the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 pass. Those who support this Act in the Congress are convinced that it will "sail through the House."

According to the Congressional Record, the intent of this bill is for the government to be responsible "...for the nutritional interests of your child, for all psychological interests of your child."

The following excerpts are taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "WHAT IS AT ISSUE IS WHETHER THE PARENT SHALL CONTINUE TO HAVE THE RIGHT TO FORM THE CHARACTER OF THE CHILDREN OR WHETHER THE STATE, WITH ALL ITS POWER & MAGNITUDE, SHALL BE GIVEN THE DECISIVE TOOLS AND TECHNIQUE FOR FORMING THE YOUNG LIVES OF THE CHILDREN OF THIS COUNTRY."

"AS A MATTER OF THE CHILD'S RIGHT, THE GOVERNMENT SHALL EXERT CONTROL OVER THE FAMILY BECAUSE WE HAVE RECOGNIZED THAT THE CHILD IS NOT THE CARE OF THE PARENTS BUT THE CARE OF THE STATE. WE RECOGNIZE FURTHER THAT NOT PARENTAL, BUT COMMUNAL FORMS OF UP-BRINGING HAVE AN UNQUESTIONABLE SUPERIORITY OVER ALL OTHER FORMS. FURTHERMORE, THERE IS SERIOUS QUESTION THAT MAYBE WE CANNOT ENTRUST THE FAMILY TO PREPARE YOUNG CHILDREN IN THIS COUNTRY FOR THIS NEW KIND OF WORLD WHICH IS EMERGING."

This all smacks of Communism. This is what in fact has been and is being done in Soviet Russia. This is what can become the law of our land, if the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 is passed by the Congress. We elected this Congress, but do we know what they are attempting to do to our freedoms and our rights?

SELECTED ARTICLES AND OTHER RELEVANT MATERIALS

The following reprints are copyrighted and not available for reproduction. These copyrighted materials have been removed from this document:

"Child-Care Scale," Linda Bird Francke & Diane Camper. Newsweek; April 5, 1976, p. 77.

"Somebody Out There Hates Day Care...and Knows Just How to Mobilize the Public with an Anonymous Smear Campaign," Judith Miller. Harper's Weekly; March 22, 1976.

"False Alarm," Howard Flieger. U.S. News & World Report, March 1, 1976.

"Congress Not Taking Over Children," Robert P. Hey. The Christian Science Monitor; February 24, 1976.

"Hatred Battles Child Care," Georgie Anne Geyer. Chicago Daily News, April 14, 1976.

"Is American Parental Role in Danger? Child Services Bills Stir Storm," Robert Signer. Chicago Daily News; March 27, 1976.

"A Lot of Excitement for Nothing." The News and Courier (Charleston, S.C.), March 7, 1976.

"A Ranting Mail Campaign." The Washington Post, February 19, 1976.

"Even Nonexistent Parts of Child Bill Draw Fire," Martha Angle. The Washington Post, February 3, 1976.

"Child-Care Opposition Mounts--and Sinks," Charles W. Bailey, Ed. Minneapolis Tribune, January 23, 1976.

"Both Sides Attack Smear Campaign on Child Care Bill," Susan Fogg. The Times-Picayune, January 16, 1976.

"Children's Bill Smear Campaign," James Deakin. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, December 28, 1975.

"Flyer Claims Bill Imperils U.S. Families," Edith K. Roosevelt. Manchester Union Leader (New Hampshire), December 27, 1975

"Day Care Bill in Congress Draws Unsigned, Violent, Outside Attack." *The Indianapolis Star*, December 12, 1975.

"Leaflet Clouds Day Care Bill," Arthur Siddon. *Chicago Tribune* (no date noted)

"Parents Angrily Attack Bill: Pamphlets Persuade Some Law Will Steal Kids," Andrew Mollison. *Dayton Daily News*, December 7, 1975.

"Brademas Proposal Defended by O'Neill." *The Indianapolis Star*, December 3, 1975.

"Misleading Charges Against Child Care Act," Robert P. Sigman. *The Kansas City Star*, November 30, 1975.

"How 'Rights' Letter Came to Houston," Richard Fly. *Houston Chronicle*, November 9, 1975.

"What the Child and Family Plan Really Would Provide," Judy Wiessler. *Houston Chronicle*, November 9, 1975.

"Federal Child-Rearing Bid Creates Monster," James J. Kilpatrick. *The Washington Star*, October 14, 1975.

"Letter from John Brademas and Walter F. Mondale." *The Goshen News*, April 9, 1976.

"Beware of Your Children, Says Smear Campaign," Marjorie Wallace. *London Sunday Times*, September 5, 1976.

"More About These Leaflets." *The Goshen News*, April 9, 1976.

"Facts Can Allay Fears." *The Sun Chronicle*, March 9, 1976.

"Anonymous Letters Stir Readers Unnecessarily." *The Sun Chronicle*, March 3, 1976.

"Editorially Speaking Agents of the Other Side," Robert A. Peck. *The Riverton Ranger* (Wyoming), February 11, 1976.

"Pernicious Smear Tactic Against Child Care Bill." *The Tennessean*, February 2, 1976.

"Faceless Critics." *The Oregonian*, January 5, 1976.

"Brademas-Mondale Bill Hit by 'Vicious' Campaign," Elizabeth Bowman. The News-Dispatch (Michigan City, Ind.), December 13, 1975.

"Smearmongers." The News-Dispatch, December 12, 1975.

"Unsigned Circular is Replete with Falsehoods and Misrepresentations." The New Prague Times (Minn.), December 11, 1975.

"Pamphlet Still Haunts Legislation," Mark Hadley. The Elkhart Truth (Ind.), December 11, 1975.

"Child-Family Act Confuses Parents," Linda Monroe. Wabash Plain Dealer (Wabash, Ind.), November 21, 1975.

"Family Services Bills Being Misrepresented." The Ann Arbor News, November 16, 1975.

"Child Bill Fraud." The Grand Rapids Press, November 11,1975.

"Child, Family Bill Maligned: Brademas." The Elkhart Truth, November 4, 1975.

"Brademas Victim of Political 'Dirty Trick'," Jack Colwell. The South Bend Tribune, November 2, 1975.

"Commune Children." Times-Union (Warsaw, Ind.), Oct. 14,1975.

"Record Set Straight," Baker, John W. and Brevard, Rosemary. Baptist Message, February 12, 1976.

"Child Care Bill, "Falsely Attacked," Draws Board-Based Organization Support." Outlook, February 1976.

"The Child and Family Services Bill: Scrubbing Away the Smear Campaign." PTA Today, February 1976.

"Anonymous Flyers Offer Strange Ideas," "How Lies Get Started," "The Truth About Child & Family Services Act." Washington Report; v16 n8 Feb. 23, 1976.

"Child Care Bill Comes Under Attack." Focus on Governmental Affairs; v10 n1 Jan. 1976.

"Mondale Defends Child-Family Services Act from Attack." D.C. Dateline, Jan. 1976.

"Legislation Would Help Youth," John W. Baker & Rosemary Brevard. Baptist Standard, December 10, 1975.

"Washington Window." AFL-CIO News; v20 n49 Dec. 6, 1975.

"The Child Care Bill," Alan Stang. American Opinion, Dec. 1975.

Washington Report; v15 n44, Nov. 24, 1975.

"Child Care Bill Supporters Reply to "Vicious Propaganda." Education Daily, Nov. 21, 1975.

WSBT-AM/FM/TV...EDITORIAL

The following editorial was broadcast over WSBT-TV on October 25, 26 & 27, 1975, and over WSBT Radio on October 27, 1975.

Little Herbie Jones is ten. He belongs to Local 53 of the American Federation of Children's Union. He's about to file suit against his folks because they forgot to take him to the zoo last week. The folks are a little upset because they've already been hit by a restraining order that says Herbie can't be forced to attend Sunday school. In a companion ruling, a judge says the parents will be in contempt of court if they make Herbie take the garbage out one more time.

Sounds stupid, doesn't it? But that's the language of a congressional measure now on Capitol Hill that is part of the overall Child and Family Services Act. The bill is being co-sponsored by Minnesota Senator Walter Mondale and Indiana's Third District Congressman John Brademas.

The overall intent of the bill is to provide protection for young people within the framework of the family unit. But buried in the measure are proposals that we feel threaten the family structure itself.

For example, the measure reads, "All children have the right of protection from, and compensation for, the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds."

Or how about this, "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."

Another gem in the bill says, "Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination."

In a paragraph that reads like a labor union contract, the bill proposes that children shall have the right to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of retaliation.

And in their final stroke, the bill's authors suggest that "The government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents, but the care of the state."

While we recognize that some legislation may be needed to insure that children receive every opportunity possible for a decent start in life, we urge Congressman Brademas to seek the elimination of these incredibly naive parts of the bill.

After all, we wouldn't want anybody to think the Congressman hadn't been raised properly.

WSBT-AM/FM/TV...EDITORIAL

The following editorial was broadcast over WSBT-TV on November 8, 9 & 10, 1975, and over WSBT Radio on November 10, 1975.

TV 22 recently aired an editorial dealing with a bill before Congress known at the Child and Family Services Act whose prime sponsor in the House is Third District Congressman John Brademas.

In opposing the bill, we cited several provisions which we were led to believe were contained in the House measure. Those statements dealt with allegations that the bill somehow would take parental control away from the family and give it to governmental agencies, and that children would have legal recourse against undue demands by parents or other authorities.

In fact, those specific provisions are not contained in the bill. The measure does contain a statement that the family is the primary and most fundemental influence on children and that services offered under the bill are intended to strengthen the role of the family and are provided on a voluntary basis to parents who request them.

The information which formed the basis for our original editorial came from material put together by vigorous opponents of the bill....a group that Congressman Brademas claims is out to smear him through a campaign of political dirty tricks.

Our editorial certainly was not intended to play into the hands of any group. We would never do that. It was simply a case of not doing proper research. For that we apologize.

Because credibility is our business, it is important for us to be right. When we're not, we'll let you know.

MAJORITY MEMBERS
CARL D. PERKINS, KY., CHAIRMAN
FRANK THOMPSON, JR., N.J.
JOHN H. DENT, PA.
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, N.J.
JOHN BRADEMAS, IND.
JAMES G. O'HARA, MICH.
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, CALIF.
WILLIAM D. FORD, MICH.
PATSY T. MINK, HAWAII (ON LEAVE)
LLOYD MEEDS, WASH.
PHILLIP BURTON, CALIF.
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, PA.
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, MO.
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, N.Y.
MARIO BIAGGI, N.Y.
IKE ANDREWS, N.C.
WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLA.
JAIME BENITEZ, P.R.
MICHAEL BLOUIN, IOWA
ROBERT CORNELL, WIS.
TED RISENHOOVER, OKLA.
PAUL SIMON, ILL.
EDWARD BEARD, R.I.
LEO ZEFERETTI, N.Y.
GEORGE MILLER, CALIF.
RONALD MOTTL, OHIO
TIM HALL, ILL.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
2181 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

MINORITY MEMBERS
ALBERT H. QUIE, MINN.
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, OHIO
ALPHONZO BELL, CALIF.
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, ILL.
MARVIN L. ESCH, MICH.
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, PA.
PETER A. PEYSER, N.Y.
RONALD A. SARASIN, CONN.
JOHN BUCHANAN, ALA.
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, VT.
LARRY PRESSLER, S. DAK.
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, PA.
VIRGINIA SMITH, NEBR.

TELEPHONES:
MAJORITY—225-4527
MINORITY—225-3725

TO: All Minority Members

FROM: Martin L. LaVor— Senior Legislative Associate

DATE: November 26, 1975

RE: The Child and Family Services Act of 1975

In recent months Members of Congress have been innundated by letters opposing enactment of H.R. 2966 and S. 626, the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. Some offices have reported receiving as many as 300 to 400 letters per week. These letters contend that the bill is "communistically inclined," "forces children to be removed from the family-oriented approach," "removes the family's right of authority over the child," "makes children totally independent and under the care of the 'state' and not the parents," "destroys the 'God-ordained' structure of the family as the basic unit of our society," and "would most certainly Sovietize American children."

There are numerous reasons for Members to oppose this bill if they so choose, but none are reflected in the concerns being voiced throughout the country in these letters. These letters are the result of fear, innuendo, and deception and represent the ultimate in the BIG LIE.

This bill is similar to the one vetoed by former President Nixon in 1971. The issues relating to the 1975 version are virtually the same as those in the earlier vetoed version. They are:

(1) The delivery system (whether the schools or public non-profit community-based organizations should run programs);
(2) Whether profit-making operations should be eligible for funds;
(3) The formula (how should funds be distributed to each state);
(4) What type of socio-economic mix should be required; and
(5) Certainly the most important item--where the funds will be found to pay for the new program.

IT MUST BE NOTED THAT IN ALL OF THE THOUSANDS OF LETTERS THAT HAVE COME INTO THE CONGRESS, NONE HAVE ADDRESSED THESE ISSUES, AND NOT ONE THAT I AM AWARE OF HAS SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED THE COST OF FUNDING THIS BILL IF IT SHOULD BECOME LAW.

To give you some idea of how the BIG LIE technique is used, the following is an excerpt from a flier (one of many) circulating throughout the country which has spurred many of these letters.

> "Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties is becoming a part of this Child Development Act. Following are four of the several items proposed in this charter. They can be found on page 44138 of the Congressional Record.
>
> (1) 'All children have the right of protection from, and compensation (sic) the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds.' (Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back to you with a civil suit.)
>
> (2) 'Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority.' The question was asked, by way of example, what do you mean by the fact 'excessive claim,' and the example was given, 'If the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it.'
>
> (3) 'Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination.' That means that you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. That also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, or any ideas, about God.
>
> (4) 'Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear or repraisals (sic).' This speaks for itself."

While it is true that this statement did appear in the Congressional Record, those who wrote the flier failed to mention that this quote and several others attributed to the Congressional Record are not part of H.R. 2966 or S. 626, but were actually taken from speeches made by Sen. Carl Curtis of Nebraska, Sen. James Buckley of New York, and Sen. James Allen of Alabama who were speaking on the Floor of the Senate in opposition to the legislation in 1971. The language quoted was picked up from articles that these gentlemen inserted in the Record. The quote shown above was, in fact, from Sen. Curtis's speech and not only does it not pertain to the present bills (nor the bill that was vetoed in 1971), but it does not even pertain to anything ongoing within the United States. The actual quote in the Record that preceded the Curtis quote was:

> "Now I will be the first to say that a child has rights. He has a right to life, certainly. He also has a right to maternal love, to adequate subsistence and care. But, being by definition immature and incapable of serious judgment, a child does not have rights stemming from judgmental responsibilities.
>
> Let me read a few of the 'rights' in the 'Charter of Children's Rights' of the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council for Civil Liberties..."

It would be possible to refute each item in these letters, point by point, but the fact remains that almost all of the issues have been thoroughly reviewed through the extensive hearings held by the House Select Education Subcommittee and the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth during the last few years. At these hearings, witnesses who both support or vigorously oppose the legislation were heard. As of this date, the Select Education Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over this legislation, does not know IF or WHEN any action will be taken on this legislation in its present or even in modified form.

One last note--it is important to recognize that Child Development or Child Care programs are not new for the federal government. Federal money has been involved with such programs in one form or another since 1935. The programs have included those authorized under Titles IV, V, and XX of the Social Security Act, Project Headstart, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the School Lunch Program, CETA, Title I of the Housing and Community Development of 1974, the Appalachian Redevelopment Commission, and the Small Business Act.

Doing something for children was and is the intent of the Child and Family Services Act. While some may disagree (with justification) over the manner in which the bill has been drafted, there should be no concern over the motives of the individuals who have sponsored and promoted this legislation.

MLV/bjk

Interreligious Statement on
THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

In December of 1971 both the House and the Senate passed the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. Supported by a coalition of poverty and civil rights groups, labor unions, women's groups, churches, educators, and community and citizens organizations, the bill would have amended Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act "to provide every child (through age 14) with a fair and full opportunity to reach his full potential by establishing and expanding comprehensive child development programs." This bill was vetoed by President Nixon.

In February of 1975, Sen. Mondale (D-Minn.) introduced a very similar bill, S. 626, The Child and Family Services Act of 1975. Rep. Brademas (D-Ind.) introduced a companion bill (H.R. 2966) in the House. This bill would establish programs of part-day and full-day child care, prenatal care, special services for minority group children, food and nutrition programs, aid for handicapped children, and various types of assistance to families with special needs.

The Child and Family Services Act is now under attack by groups and individuals charging that it would give government undue authority over family life. In fact, some groups have charged that the proposed legislation would make the "government responsible for . . . the religious interests of your child," give "children the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents," and make preschool education "compulsory" for all children beginning at age three.

These charges are totally inaccurate. There is nothing in this legislation that relates to religious preferences or religious instruction; nothing that relates to or alters the existing legal relationship between parents and their children; and nothing that provides for compulsory preschool education, or for compulsory service of any kind.

What it seeks to do, instead, is to strengthen and support families in their efforts to provide their children -- on a totally voluntary basis -- with the basic health, education and other services they want for them but too often cannot afford. Thus, it authorizes funding for a variety of child and family services including prenatal health care, medical treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions, and day care services for children of working parents.

Most importantly, any and all of these programs are totally voluntary, and limited to children whose parents request the services. Parent control is further assured by requirements that all programs would be selected, established and controlled by parents whose children participate in them.

A careful reading of the bill reveals that it will support families, not weaken them. The bill states, for example, that the "family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children" and that "child anf family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family."

The need for legislation of this kind is clear. The infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than that of thirteen other nations. Each year an estimated 200,000 children are struck by handicaps which could have been prevented if their

[over]

mothers had received early health care. Forty percent of the young children of this country are not fully immunized against childhood diseases. Sixty-five percent of all handicapped preschool children are not receiving special services. There are only one million spaces in licensed day care homes and centers to serve the six million preschool children whose parents are working.

Debate over legislative proposals such as this Child and Family Services Act should be based on the facts, and decided on the merits. To do otherwise -- to misrepresent the purpose and provisions of the legislation under discussion -- is a disservice to all Americans concerned about families and children.

American Jewish Committee
Ms. Anne Wolfe
Director, Social Welfare

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Disciples Peace Fellowship

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Department of Church in Society
Division of Homeland Ministries

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

Friends Committee on National Legislation
Lutheran Family and Children's Services
St. Louis, Missouri

Lutheran Welfare Services of Illinois

Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota

National Council of Churches

National Conference of Catholic Charities

National Council of Jewish Women
Mrs. Esther R. Landa
National President

Network

Synagogue Council of America

Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates
Camp Hill, Pa.

United Church of Christ
Center for Social Action

United Methodist Church
Women's Division
Board of Global Ministries

United Presbyterian Church, USA
Washington Office

nwpc

National Women's Political Caucus
1921 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 785-2911

NATIONAL CHAIRWOMAN:
Audrey Rowe Colom

VICE CHAIRWOMEN:
Vivian Hall
Rhea Mojica Hammer
Lee Novick
Anita Nelam
Betsy Griffith

ADVISORY BOARD:
Frances T. Farenthold, Chairwoman
Hon. Bella Abzug
Nikki Beare
Liz Carpenter
Joan Cashin
Hon. Shirley Chisholm
Mary Clarke
Myrlie Evers
Brenda Feigen Fasteau
Ronnie Feit
Betty Friedan
Jo-Ann Evans Gardner
Comm. Elinor Guggenheimer
Fannie Lou Hamer
LaDonna Harris
Wilma Scott Heide
Dorothy Height
Bobbie Greene Kilberg
Margaret Laurence
Olga Madar
Vivian Carter Mason
Midge Miller
Elly Peterson
Jill Ruckelshaus
Beulah Sanders
Gloria Steinem
Carole Ann Taylor

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:
Jane Pierson McMichael

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE
A Position Paper

THE PROBLEM: AS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS FORCE MORE WOMEN INTO THE LABOR MARKET, THE LACK OF ADEQUATE, AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE HAS BECOME ONE OF THE MOST PRESSING PROBLEMS FACING AMERICAN FAMILIES.

CHILDREN'S NEEDS:

- Mothers of 27 million children, six million under the age of six, are in the labor force.
- Since 1970 the mothers of 1.2 million children have gone to work.
- The number of children living in families headed by women is growing at a staggering rate; it more than doubled from 1960 to 1974.
- Estimates are that licensed day care centers have only one million places for the six million pre-school children whose mothers work.
- Competent care is available at a price; but those who cannot afford that price are cared for in a variety of inadequate ways: by aging relatives, or slightly older siblings. Some are "latch-key" children, looking after themsleves and checking in by telephone with the parent.
- Many families are forced to settle for less than adequate care, because quality care is too expensive or not available.

PARENT'S NEEDS:

- 34% of married women with children under the age of six are in the labor force.
- Among two parent families, over 15 million wives must work because they are married to men who earn less than $10,000.
- In female headed households, where the mother is unemployed, the annual median income is $3,960. If the mother is employed, the median family income is $6,195.
- Two-thirds of the female heads of households with school aged children are in the labor force, 47% of those have pre-school children.

SOLUTION: NWPC SUPPORTS COMPREHENSIVE, FEDERALLY FUNDED CHILD CARE LEGISLATION WHICH ALLOCATES AT LEAST 2 BILLION DOLLARS FOR QUALITY CHILD CARE PROGRAMS AND OTHER FAMILY SERVICES. THIS LEGISLATION MUST PROVIDE:

1. Funding to stimulate the expansion and development of many kinds of child care services: group care, family day care, after school care, work-based care. Families need more child care options to meet the existing and growing demand. Group care operated for profit should not receive federal funds.

2. Free services for families with incomes at or below the Bureau of Labor Statistics Lower Living Standard budget.

3. Access to services for all other families according to sliding fee scale based on a realistic ability to pay.

4. Voluntary participation in all services and programs.

5. Substantial parental participation in the design and administration of the programs.

6. Staff/child ratios that will ensure quality care.

7. Emphasis on programs of child development, nutrition and health, utilizing experts to provide advice, as needed, to guarantee quality services.

8. Funds for monitoring and enforcing standards.

9. Funds to encourage the utilization of professional staff and the training and use of para-professionals with opportunities for career advancement.

FURTHERMORE: AS A SUPPLEMENT TO COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE LEGISLATION NWPC SUPPORTS CHANGES IN THE TAX LAWS THAT ALLOW ALL WORKING PARENTS EITHER A DEDUCTION OR A TAX CREDIT FOR THE COSTS OF CHILD CARE WHICHEVER, IS MOST ADVANTAGEOUS TO LOW AND MODERATE INCOME PARENTS.

(Currently, tax law provides a deduction only for the 30% of taxpayers who itemize deductions. In addition, when one spouse is in school or works part time, or a relative cares for the child, parents are not eligible for the deduction.)

OPPONENTS ARGUE THAT:

1. A comprehensive child care program costs too much and the country cannot afford it.

ANSWER: We must re-order national priorities to emphasize spending that meets human needs. Providing funds for growth and development of children will be more beneficial to this country's health in the long run than the production of more missiles. We cannot afford to shortchange the children, for while they represent 33% of the population, they represent 100% of our future. Secondly, provision of quality child care services allows employment of parents and will directly reduce the cost of dependency-welfare, food stamps and institutionalization.

Finally, the use of public funds for the education of children six and over is universally accepted. Publicly funded developmental programs should also be available for those wishing to enroll their children before that arbitrarily determined age.

2. The Government should not be involved in child care at all, for that is the beginning of a Soviet style communal approach to child rearing.

ANSWER: People who say this are not familiar with the current proposals before Congress or are deliberately distorting them. The pending legislation has built in safeguards against state control of child rearing practices. All programs are voluntary with strong emphasis on parental involvement.

3. The expansion of day care facilities will further weaken the already crumbling family unit in this country.

ANSWER: The number of pre-school aged children with working mothers has already been documented. An expansion of child care services will actually strengthen family life: many women going off to work will be able to do so without worrying that their children are improperly cared for, secure in the knowledge that their children are in an enriching environment.

CONCLUSION: The National Women's Political Caucus supports the Mondale-Brademas Child and Family Services Act (S. 626 and H.R. 2966) currently pending before the 94th Congress. Only through such comprehensive legislation, designed to provide services which sustain both parents and children, can we begin to solve the needs of this country's children for adequate child care.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR. REGARDING ALLEGATIONS IN THE UNSIGNED FLYER

[From Congressional Record, Dec. 1, 1975]

THE VICIOUS AND DISHONEST CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'Neill) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Madam Speaker, few matters concern me more than the growing erosion of confidence by Americans in their public officials.

Of course, when those who hold public office abuse their trust, I understand how citizens can lose faith.

But when that confidence is destroyed as a result of tactics of smear and deception, the tactics of Watergate, unwittingly aided by a lackadaisical press, I feel it important to protest such tactics.

And, Madam Speaker, I must report to the House that I believe such tactics of smear and deception are today being used, in reckless disregard of the facts, to attack a piece of legislation which has been introduced by 124 Members of the House of Representatives and Senate, of both our political parties.

The bill to which I refer is the Child and Family Services Act of 1975, which has been introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Brademas), and the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale) as well as by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. Mink), the gentleman from California (Mr. Bell), the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. Heckler), the senior Senator from New York (Mr. Javits), and as I have already indicated, many other Members of the House and Senate, both Democrats and Republicans.

PURPOSE OF THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

Mr. Speaker, the principal purpose of the proposed Child and Family Service Act is, in the language of the bill, H.R. 2966:

> To provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those pre-school children and families with the greatest need, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decisionmaking at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served and other individuals and organizations in the community interested in child and family service (making the best possible use of public and private resources), through a partnership of parents, State and local government, and the Federal Government, building upon the experience and success of Headstart and other existing programs.

The bill also, in its statement of findings and purposes, reads as follows:

> SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that--
>
> (1) the family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children;
>
> (2) child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services, with a view toward offering families the options they believe to be most appropriate for their particular needs;
>
> (3) although there have been increased services for children of working mothers and single parents and although Headstart and similar programs have provided supplemental educational and other services for children, such services have not been made available to families to the extent that parents consider necessary; there are many parents who are working full or part time without adequate arrangements for their children, and there are many children whose families lack sufficient resources to obtain adequate health, nutritional, educational, and other services;
>
> (4) it is essential that the planning and operation of programs be undertaken as a partnership of parents, community, private agencies and State and local government with appropriate supportive assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, despite the findings and purpose of the proposed Child and Family Services Act of 1975, this bill has been the subject of some of the most scurrilous and misleading propaganda that I have ever seen.

Members of Congress in Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas have received a substantial amount of mail from their constituents attacking alleged provisions of the bill which in fact are not in the bill nor ever contemplated by its sponsors for inclusion in it.

UNSIGNED FLYER BEING CIRCULATED

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of giving wider circulation to these false and vicious attacks, I shall here insert one of the apparent sources of this correspondence, the following flyer, which, unsigned by any sponsoring organization, has been circulated in mimeographed form in a number of States across the country:

RAISING CHILDREN—GOVERNMENT'S OR PARENT'S RIGHT?

There is before Congress legislation known as The Child & Family Service Act of 1975 (Senate: S262 & House: HR2966). If passed it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the Government.

CHILD ADVOCACY CLAUSE

In the Congressional Record we read: "If, in the judgment of those who are in charge of such a program (the State by way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a "specialist" appointed by the government) would enter the home and direct the education, even with the home. And, if the parent would object, the authority in the home would, De Facto, be transferred to these advocated."

Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties is becoming a part of this Child Development Act. Following are four of the several items proposed in this charter. They can be found on page 44138 of the Congressional Record.

(1)" All Children have the right of protection from, and compensation the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds." (Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back to you with a civil suit.)

(2) "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority." The question was asked, by way of example, what do you mean by the fact "Excessive claim", and the example was given, "If the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it."

(3) "Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination." That means that you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. That also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, or any ideas, about God.

(4) "Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of reprisals." This speaks for itself.

This piece of legislation was vetoed in 1971, but it is back on the floor of Congress and now has the votes to pass. It is our obligation to tell our legislators: Senators Bayh and Hartke & our U.S. Representatives what we think of this legislation. Only our complaints can change their minds. They take your vote seriously. Take the trouble to write or suffer the consequences of your silence.

CAN THE GOVERNMENT TAKE AWAY YOUR CHILDREN?

Comprehensive child development, the Soviet-style system of communal child rearing which almost became law in this country in 1971 is once again being pushed through Congress. The current bills HR2966 (House of Representatives) S626 (Senate), are virtually identical to the original act passed in 1971, but fortunately vetoes by the then president, Nixon. Now it is known as the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 and any changes are merely cosmetic.

In vetoing the original bill which would have removed children from their parent's instruction shortly after birth, Mr. Nixon said that it would weaken the American family by committing "the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family oriented approach."

We are in serious danger of "Sovietizing" the education of our children if we let the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 pass. Those who support this Act in the Congress are convinced that it will "Sail through the House."

According to the Congressional Record, the intent of this bill is for the government to be responsible . . . for the nutritional interests of your child, for all Psychological interests of your child."

The following excerpts are taken from the Congressional Record: "What is at issue is whether the parent shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the State, with all its power & magnitude, shall be given the decisive tools and techniques for forming the young lives of the children of this country."

"As a matter of the child's right, the Government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents but the care of the

> State. We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of up-bringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms. Furthermore, there is serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children in this country for this new kind of world which is emerging."
>
> This all smacks of Communism. This is what in fact has been and is being done in Soviet Russia. This is what can become the law of our land, if the Child & Family Service Act of 1975 is passed by the Congress. We elected this Congress, but do we know what they are attempting to do to our freedoms and our rights?

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS ANALYSIS DISCREDITS FLYER

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that every fair-minded Member of this House must agree that the statements contained in this flyer are not only outrageous distortions of the purpose of the proposed legislation but gross falsifications of the actual language of the bill.

In fact, a point-by-point analysis of this handbill made by the Library of Congress demonstrates that virtually all of the statements in it were either made by Senators or others who in 1971 opposed similar legislation or are apparently, statements taken from publications of an organization in a foreign country and falsely attributed to the child and family services bill.

I cite, for example, the "Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties" referred to in the flyer.

The flyer alleges that this "charter" to which I refer "is becoming a part of" the child and family services bill.

The fact is that such a "charter" has never even been considered in the House of Representatives and will not become a part of the legislation.

Rather, the "charter" cited in the flyer was mentioned in a speech made on December 2, 1971, by Senator Carl Curtis of Nebraska in opposing the comprehensive child development bill which was then under consideration.

The charter, according to Senator Curtis, was developed by a British organization and, as the Library of Congress study notes, Mr. Speaker, Senator Curtis did not claim in his statement that the charter "is becoming a part of" the bill.

SAFEGUARDS OF PARENTAL RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, the charges in the flyer are, of course, absurd and irresponsible.

The sponsors of the bill have carefully drafted it to protect the rights of parents and their children: First, participation in any program authorized by the bill would be completely voluntary. Children would not participate without the specific request of a parent or legal guardian.

Second, children would not be tested unless the parent or guardian were informed and given the opportunity to except the child from testing.

Third, the bill contains specific language providing protection against any interference with the moral or legal rights of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, or physical development of their children.

THE POISON SPREADS

So how, Mr. Speaker, does such outrageous material as that contained in the flyers I have cited spread like wildfire throughout the country?

I am afraid that I must report that this poison has been spread in large part by some journalists who have reported as fact the contents of these flyers without even bothering to check to learn if the material was indeed contained in the bill.

Let me give you some examples.

In Texas, T. S. Hancock, director of the Region 4 Education Service Center in Houston, mailed a copy of the flyer to Houston area school superintendents with a note saying:

> I urge that you take the time to read the attached information. I believe it has frightening implications to our American way of life.

Yet Hancock later admitted to Richard Fly, a reporter for the Houston Chronicle, that he had not read the legislation or checked the flyer's accuracy before sending it to the school administrators.

Apparently, the flyer was brought to Mr. Hancock's attention by a listener to Houston radio station KTRH where announcer Dewey Compton had on October 14, 1975, broadcast information about the flyer and the legislation. Again, Mr. Compton failed to do any checking before he made his broadcast.

Thanks to good work by Phil Mosely, press aide to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer), much of the fear that the Crompton broadcast and Hancock letter aroused were diminished. But the poison had spread throughout the Houston area before Mr. Mosely was able to report that the statements were inaccurate.

WSBT–TV EDITORIAL

In the district represented by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Brademas) the news director of a major television station in South Bend, WSBT–TV, delivered the following totally false editorial on October 25, 26, and 27, 1975, and on WSBT radio on October 27:

> Little Herbie Jones is ten. He belongs to Local 53 of the American Federation of Children's Unions. He's about to file suit against his folks because they forgot to take him to the zoo last week. The folks are a little upset because they've already been hit by a restraining order that says Herbie can't be forced to attend Sunday school. In a companion ruling, a judge says the parents will be in contempt of court if they make Herbie take the garbage out one more time.
>
> Sounds stupid, doesn't it. But that's the language of a congressional measure now on Capitol Hill that is part of the overall Child and Family Services Act. The bill is being co-sponsored by Minnesota Senator Walter Mondale and Indiana's Third District Congressman John Brademas.
>
> The overall intent of the bill is to provide protection for young people within the framework of the family unit. But buried in the measure are proposals that we feel threaten the family structure itself.
>
> For example, the measure reads, "All children have the right of protection from, and compensation for, the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds."
>
> Or how about this, "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."
>
> Another gem in the bill says, "Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination."
>
> In a paragraph that reads like a labor union contract, the bill proposes that children shall have the right to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of retaliation.
>
> And in their final stroke, the bill's authors suggest that "The government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents, but the care of the state."
>
> While we recognize that some legislation may be needed to insure that children receive every opportunity possible for a decent start in life, we urge Congressman Brademas to seek the elimination of these incredibly naive parts of the bill.
>
> After all, we wouldn't want anybody to think the Congressman hadn't been raised properly.

WSBT–TV RETRACTS

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the news director of WSBT–TV made no effort to read the child and family services bill before delivering the editorial nor did he make any inquiry of Mr. Brademas, principal sponsor of the legislation and the Representative in Congress of the district where this station is located.

I am pleased to report that, 2 weeks later, station WSBT issued the following retraction on November 8, 1975:

> TV 22 recently aired an editorial dealing with a bill before Congress known as the Child and Family Services Act whose prime sponsor in the House is Third District Congressman John Brademas.
>
> In opposing the bill, we cited several provisions which we were led to believe were contained in the House measure. Those statements dealt with allegations that the bill somehow would take parental control away from the family and give it to government agencies, and that children would have legal recourse against undue demands by parents or other authorities.

> In fact, those specific provisions are not contained in the bill. The measure does contain a statement that the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children and that services offered under the bill are intended to strengthen the role of the family and are provided on a voluntary basis to parents who request them.
>
> The information which formed the basis for our original editorial came from material put together by vigorous opponents of the bill . . . a group that Congressman Brademas claims is out to smear him through a campaign of political dirty tricks.
>
> Our editorial certainly was not intended to play into the hands of any group. We would never do that. It was simply a case of not doing proper research. For that we apologize.
>
> Because credibility is our business, it is important for us to be right. When we're not we'll let you know.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, as a consequence of this and other editorial attacks on the bill made in reckless disregard of the facts, mail has been flooding to the offices of Members from northern Indiana and southern Michigan.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NEWS MEDIA

Mr. Speaker, the two examples I have cited were of a radio station in Texas and a television station in Indiana. Fortunately, the Federal Communications Commission has the responsibility to oversee such recklessness on the part of the electronic media.

Such protection, of course, does not exist with respect to such reckless disregard of the facts on the part of newspapers or magazines.

Newspaper reporters and editorial writers ought therefore to exercise all the more care and responsibility in dealing with subjects of this nature.

Such, unfortunately, has not been the case, for, I regret to report, many newspapers in the country have editorially condemned the child and family services bill by citing the provisions alleged by the flyer I have inserted in the RECORD and thereby falling hook, line, and sinker for the propaganda distributed by these unknown extremist groups.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., PRESS

On the other hand, a number of newspapers have forthrightly condemned such extremist propaganda. For example, an editorial in the Grand Rapids, Mich., Press editorial of November 11, 1975, refers to the flyer as "one of the most specious and inflammatory leaflets to gain widespread distribution in the Grand Rapids area."

Says this newspaper:

> The extent to which the Federal Government should involve itself in family services is a proper issue which can be debated responsibly. What is not responsible, however, is the distribution of emotional and patently false material which makes rational discussion all but impossible. It is the politics of fright.

SOUTH BEND, IND., TRIBUNE

The South Bend, Ind., Tribune, after running an excellent news story on the dishonest flyer, published a similar editorial entitled "Child and Family Services," on November 11, 1975.

Said the South Bend Tribune editorial:

> We have read the bill ourself, in addition to a malicious, unsigned flyer opposing it and other arguments pro and con. We find no evidence that the bill would lead to the "sovietization" of the education of American children, whatever that might mean. On the contrary, the measure explicitly makes provisions of the bill voluntary and provides for the participation of parents in its implementation.

GOSHEN, IND., NEWS

The Goshen, Ind., News, which had reprinted on October 22, 1975, an editorial from another newspaper also based on the dishonest flyer, published a retraction on November 7, 1975, entitled, "An Apology to Brademas."

Said the Goshen News:

> To distribute leaflets with false information is hardly the proper way to oppose the legislation. It really is an unfair "smear attempt" to suggest that "hardly a citizen realizes that we are voting ourselves into Communism without a whimper of protest" and that the bill "will cost you about the last vestige of control over the family you think you have."

ANN ARBOR, MICH., NEWS

The Ann Arbor, Mich., News said, in a Sunday, November 16, editorial:

> Such legislation is always subject to debate, but the debate should be based on facts and not on misinformation circulated as a scare tactic. It is difficult to determine the truth and even to understand some of the legislation being proposed in Lansing and Washington. It is totally irresponsible to misrepresent it.

Mr. Speaker, as the Grand Rapids Press says:

> Finally, the purported "facts" contained in the flyer are so outlandish and totally out of character for the bill's respected sponsors—Rep. John Brademas of Indiana and Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota—that they should be discounted out of hand.

THOMAS L. BLAXTON OF OKLAHOMA

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is one other individual whom I would like to mention in commending those who have vigorously stood up for the truth in the face of the campaign and deception that is being waged against the child and family services bill.

That man is the Reverend Thomas L. Blaxton of Yukon, Okla.

When the poison hit his area in western Oklahoma, he went to the district office of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. English) to request the facts about the bill.

On finding that the flyers were inaccurate, the Reverend Mr. Blaxton wrote to all the clerymen in his town in order to enable them to refute the propaganda during their Sunday services. He also sent a letter to the editors of two newspapers in Oklahoma City. His letter, also printed in the Yukon Review, concludes by saying:

> Parents, we better wake up, shake ourselves good, study these bills and write our Senators and Representatives to support the bill as it now is and for them to be on the alert for the tricks of those who oppose it. . . . Just remember the next paper you are handed that has no heading or signature. Throw it in the trashcan, better yet burn it so no one will be misled and confused by it.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, whether we support or oppose this legislation, I urge that every Member of the House be on alert for the fearmongers who spread such poison throughout the land. For credibility and confidence in the efforts of responsible Members of Congress cannot be allowed to suffer at the hands of malicious individuals who spread such outrageous falsehoods.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of the distortions of the Child and Family Services Act was presented to the Senate by Senator Mondale and can be found starting on page S20397 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 19, 1975.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, further to assist Members in answering correspondence on this matter, I am pleased to insert the following material:

[Articles from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Nov. 7 and 9, 1975]

OFFICIAL MAILS MISLEADING LETTER TO AREA SCHOOL HEADS

(By Richard Fly)

An unsigned and apparently inaccurate letter encouraging opposition to family service legislation pending in Congress has been distributed to area school superintendents by the director of the Houston area regional office of the Texas Education Agency.

The letter, which apparently originated in Kansas, was mailed to superintendents Oct. 27 by T. S. Hancock, director of the Region IV Education Service Center in Houston.

Hancock attached a note to the letter stating. "I urge that you take the time to read the attached information. I believe it has frightening implications to our American way of life."

Hancock said Thursday he did not read the legislation or check the letter's accuracy before sending it to the school administrators.

At least one of the superintendents, Dr. C. Lee Meyer of the Pasadena school district, passed the letter on to his district's personnel.

Meyer said he also did not check the accuracy of the letter before passing it along.

The letter's statements purportedly refer to the Child and Family Service Act of 1975, introduced in the House and Senate Feb. 7.

Phil Moseley, press aide to U.S. Rep. Bill Archer, R-Houston, said that after receiving numerous inquiries about the anonymous letter, he researched the statements contained in it.

Three-fourths of those statements were excerpted from congressional debate on a bill of the same title in 1971, Moseley said.

However, Moseley said, most of the statements are taken out of context and presented in such a way as to distort their meaning.

The letter was brought to the attention of the TEA's regional office by a Galveston County school official who heard about it on a broadcast by KTRH radio personality Dewey Compton.

Compton said Thursday he originally broadcast information about the letter and legislation Oct. 14. Since then, he said Moseley "dug into the letter's content and found much of it to be fraudulent."

He said that Thursday morning he retracted his radio statements on the letter, which he said came from Kansas.

"It's a mess," Compton said. "It looks like a lot of us are victims of a fraud or a conspiracy."

He said it was regrettable that he did not check the letter and verify it before reading it on the air.

TEA's Hancock said he talked with Moseley, who would provide him with information on the letter's contents and the provisions of the family service act. Hancock said he would pass that information to the superintendents.

He said the statements in the letter considerably alarmed him, and on that basis he informed school district administrators of the legislation.

He said that since he talked with Moseley about the letter's questionable contents, "I'm not as concerned now (about the bill) as I was."

But Hancock said, "I'm still concerned that something like this might come out of Congress. Guidelines for the enforcement of such bills sometimes are rather drastic."

Meyer, of Pasadena, said, "All I did was pass along the information I received from the regional service center."

He said he would read the bill, which he received Thursday afternoon, and that if any corrections need to be made concerning the letter, he will inform the district personnel.

Moseley pointed to several inaccuracies or distortions in the letter.

One part of the letter mentioned a "Charter of Children's Rights" proposed items in this charter were:

"All children have the right of protection from and compensation for the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds."

"Children have the right to protection, from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."

"Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of reprisals."

The charter was referred to by Sen. Carl T. Curtis, R-Neb., during debate on Dec. 2, 1971, as an example of how far the legislation could go in its interpretation. The charter, Curtis said, was recommended in England by an education advisory commission and was the product of the English National Council of Civil Liberties.

The letter did not mention that the charter originated in England and was not planned for inclusion in Congress's legislation.

In addition, Moseley said, three paragraphs at the end of the letter, purportedly from the Congressional Record, actually are a compilation of statements from debate on the legislation, an unrelated article on education and child raising in the Soviet Union and other material apparently added by the letter's unknown author.

One sentence from this portion of the letter said:

"As a matter of the child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents by the care of the state."

One sentence from this portion of the letter said:

"As a matter of the child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents but the care of the state."

That sentence is from the article on the Soviet Union.

Moseley said Archer's office is getting a large amount of mail from school superintendents, principals, teachers and parents in the Houston area.

"Some are saying, 'This can't be true. You've got to stop the legislation.' Others are saying, 'It isn't true, is it?' " Moseley said.

The Child and Family Services Act now pending in Congress states, in part, "The family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children, child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services."

Hearings on the legislation ended in the House Subcommittee on Education July 16. A full committee vote has not been taken. It appeared that action on the bill would not be taken this year.

HOW "RIGHTS" LETTER CAME TO HOUSTON

(By Richard Fly)

An anonymous letter warned that a bill pending in Congress would destroy the American family.

The letter made its way from a revival meeting in Missouri to a compost and feed company in Kansas and from there to a Beeville merchant and thence to a Houston radio station. It ended up in offices of more than 50 school superintendents in the Houston area.

In the fashion of a chain letter, the unsigned epistle was copied, passed along and copied again as people reacted with alarm to the claims in the letter that the Child and Family Service Act of 1975 would destroy family structure and make children wards of the state.

The actual legislation bears little resemblance to the bill described in the letter. But few of the letter's recipients questioned whether it was true before passing the letter along.

The letter arrived in Houston about four weeks ago. It was first publicized by KTRH radio personality Dewey Compton, who read the letter on his program and asked listeners to write their congressmen opposing the bill.

Compton said his office distributed about 200 copies of the letter at the request of listeners.

One of those listeners was a Galveston County school administrator, who passed the letter along to the Region IV Education Service Center, an office of the Texas Education Agency, in Houston.

The center's director, T. S. Hancock, was alarmed by the letter, he said, and sent it to the more than 50 school district superintendents in the region.

In a note attached to the letter, he said: "I urge that you take the time to read the attached information. I believe it has frightening implications to our American way of life."

At least one superintendent, Dr. C. Lee Meyer of the Pasadena school district then passed the letter along to the district's personnel.

The majority of the statements in the letter are excepted from the Congressional Record, a daily chronicle of proceedings in Congress.

However, Phil Moseley, a press aide to U.S. Rep. Bill Archer of Houston, researched the contents of the letter. He said most of the statements are taken out of context and tied together in such a way as to distort their meaning.

The statements are taken from the record of debate on Dec. 2, 1971. At that time, Congress was debating a similar, but stronger, bill than the one now before them.

Moseley pointed to several inaccuracies and distortions in the letter.

One part of the letter mentioned a "Charter of Children's Rights." Proposed Items in this charter were:

"All children have to right of protection from and compensation for the consequence of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds."

"Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."

"Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and other without fear of reprisals."

The charter was referred to by Sen. Carl T. Curtis, R-Neb., during debate on Dec. 2, 1971, as an example of how far the legislation could go in its interpretation. The charter, Curtis said, was recommended in England by an education advisory commission and was the product of the English National Council of Civil Liberties.

The letter did not mention that the "charter" originated in England among a group of Socialists, was not part of English law and was not planned for inclusion in Congress's legislation.

In addition, Moseley said, three paragraphs as the end of the letter, purportedly from the Congressional Record, actually are a compilation of statements from debate on the legislation, an unrelated article on education and child raising in the Soviet Union and other material apparently added by the letter's unknown author.

One sentence from this portion of the letter said:

"As a matter of the child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents but the care of the state."

That sentence is from the article on the Soviet Union.

How the letter made its way from Kansas to Houston is a saga of happenstances.

Hancock, of the Region IV center, received a copy of the letter from an assistant, Tom Pate. Pate received the letter from Dr. Henry Willis, assistant superintendent of the Santa Fe school district in Galveston County, who received a copy from Compton.

Compton received his copy from Jack Megason, a Beeville resident whose agricultural products business is a sponsor of Compton's radio program. Megason received the letter from George Seacat, a compost retailer in Ashland, Kan., who received it from a friend.

Seacat's friend picked up the letter in the Dodge City Supply Co., Dodge City, Kan.

The letters arrived in the store from an unknown source, the company's manager said.

Here there is a gap which picks back up at Radio Station in KMAN in Manhattan, Kan.

The press director of the Kansas Farm Bureau, a conservative lobby group, based one of his KMAN radio programs on the family service legislation. He interviewed a farmer, Richard Bayshor, who had heard a broadcast on Radio Station KFRM in Wichita, Kan., opposing the bill and referring to statements made in the letter.

KFRM did its broadcast on the basis of a note to the editor clipped from the Salina, Kan., Journal.

The note, written by David and Karen Smith, was based on the letter.

Smith received the letter from Richard Burson, retired director of the Kansas Bible Camp near Hutchinson.

Burson was the source of the letter which reached Houston and many other parts of the country.

"I only put out a thousand of them," Burson said, "and I'm surprised how far they've scattered."

He said he compiled his one-page letter from a three-page pamphlet he received from his brother-in-law's sister. She received the pamphlet at a revival in Missouri.

He rewrote the letter to make it shorter and tone down the "screaming" language Burson said.

Burson's letter appears to be the one which has circulated the farthest and had the largest effect.

He said he stopped distributing the letter about a week after he started. He did so, he said, because he found out the letter was misleading.

"I think that many people who read this and seem to think that the Congressional Record account that is presented is the bill. But it isn't the bill. It is simply a discussion of the bill by people who were opposed to it," he said.

He also said people would be led to believe the statements in the letter referred to the 1975 bill. Actually, he said, it refers to the 1971 legislation.

Burson said he is "sort of sorry" he distributed the letter, because he has since received better information about the bill from Sen. Robert Dole, R-Kan., which he plans to distribute.

But the effects of the letter cannot so easily be dispersed.

Congressmen are receiving a large number of letters and phone calls about the legislation.

Hearings on the bill in the House subcommittee on education ended July 16. No action has been taken on it, so it appears doubtful that it will get out of committee before the end of the year.

But the letters keep coming.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Nov. 9, 1975]

WHAT THE CHILD AND FAMILY PLAN REALLY WOULD PROVIDE

(By Judy Wiessler)

WASHINGTON.—Until a few weeks ago, the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 was just another of the hundreds of bills with popular sounding titles and steep price tags languishing in congressional subcommittees.

Then, with a speed and intensity that neither congressional opponents nor proponents profess to fully understand, the bill became the subject of torrents of mail to members of Congress. Most of it was negative and based on false impressions of what the legislators would do.

Sponsored by Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., and John Brademas, D-Ind., the bill is controversial in its own right.

But not because it would take children away from their parents, put them in communes, allow them to organize labor unions or sue their parents if they were forced to go to Sunday school or mow the lawn.

Such allegations, circulated broadly and anonymously, are seen by both sides as a threat to the prospect of serious debate on the real issues of whether the federal government should invest millions of dollars in a broad, new social program.

Even opponents of the bill, like Rep. Bob Casey, D-Houston, are uncomfortable with some of the propaganda. Casey is against the bill because he thinks "it costs too much and the federal government shouldn't be setting up day care centers across the country," an aide said. But he added that many constituents are writing letters based on information that is "inflammatory and completely false."

What the bill actually proposes is expenditure of $150 million next year, increasing to $1 billion in 1978, for a wide range of programs, including day care and health services, for children and, in some cases, their parents.

Priority would be given to services for children under 6, to needy families, families with working mothers and minorities.

Although the programs would be mostly funded by the federal government, they would be operated on the local level by governing boards on which parents of participating children could make up at least half the membership.

Children would not be allowed to participate in any of the program unless their parents or legal guardians specifically requested that they do so. The bill prohibits any practice which would "infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal responsibilities of parents or guardians."

Parental permission would be required for any research or experimentation or medical or psychological examination involving a child.

A very similar Mondale-Brademas bill was killed in 1971 when Congress failed to override a veto by then-President Richard Nixon, who called the earlier bill "family weakening."

However, sponsors have a list of more than 80 groups which they say have endorsed the measure as "family strengthening." Those include the National Parent-Teachers Association, National Educational Association, National Association of School Boards, AFL-CIO, American Association of University Women, Girl Scouts of America, Boys Clubs of America, Salvation Army and National Leagues of Cities.

Religious groups supporting the bill include the United Methodist Church, Baptist groups, Church of God, United Church of Christ, Episcopal Church, American Lutheran Church and B'nai B'rith.

The bill would establish a new Office of Child and Family Services within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to coordinate the local programs.

Units of local government, such as cities and counties, would apply to HEW to become "sponsors" of the programs and would set up the local governing boards with parent representatives.

The local boards would decide what kinds of programs are needed in their areas, choosing from a long list of the kinds of services authorized.

These include day care, educational programs before and after school and in the summer, family counseling, prenatal and post-partum medical care to mothers who cannot afford to pay, special help such as bilingual tutoring for minorities and migrants and activities geared to physically, mentally or emotionally handicapped children.

The bill requires that information be disseminated regularly to parents about available activities, that parents be consulted regularly on each child's development and that parents be allowed to "observe and participate in their children's activities."

Provisions of the bill have been sufficiently appealing to attract 29 cosponsors in the Senate and 94 in the House, including Reps. Barbara Jordan, D-Houston, and Henry B. Gonzalez, D-San Antonio.

But there is considerable skepticism, shared privately by some proponents, that the bill will become law unless it is scaled down dramatically.

Sponsors assume President Ford would veto such an expensive measure and achnowledge it could be difficult to muster the two-thirds vote necessary for an override, especially in the Senate.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Nov. 2, 1975]

BRADEMAS VICTIM OF POLITICAL "DIRTY TRICK"

(By Jack Colwell)

Congressman John Brademas has been the victim of a political "dirty trick" which apparently resulted in erroneous statements in a WSBT television and radio editorial about a bill Brademas is sponsoring.

The "dirty trick" involves distribution of an unsigned leaflet attacking the proposed Child and Family Services Act and containing false statements about the intent of the measure and "children's rights" which it allegedly would provide.

While the bill is controversial, it contains none of the "children's rights" sections quoted in the leaflet and also cited in the broadcast editorial and in newspaper editorials printed in Warsaw and Goshen.

Brademas said Saturday that the leaflets were being circulated in Northern Indiana in "a deliberate effort" to spread "false information" in tactics similar to those of Watergate fame.

"Never in my 17 years as a representative in Congress have I seen a more systematic, wilful attempt to smear both me and my work in the House of Representatives," Brademas said.

Quotations in the leaflet about so-called "children's rights" to "make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of reprisals" appear nowhere in the bill.

Brademas said the quotations apparently were taken from a speech made in 1971 by Sen. Carl Curtis of Nebraska, who said at the time he was quoting from the "Charter of Children's Rights" of the "British Advisory Center of Education" and the "National Council for Civil Liberties."

None of the "rights" quoted in the leaflet and in the editorials appear in the bill he is sponsoring or were even contemplated in similar legislation in the past, Brademas said.

In several instances in the leaflet, there are references to something allegedly appearing in the Congressional Record, but it does not specify who put the statement in the Congressional Record or was quoted in the Congressional Record or when the statement was made or in what context.

The congressman said he has asked WSBT to "correct" erroneous impressions which may have resulted from the editorial.

Jack E. Douglas, station manager, said Saturday that the quotations to which Brademas has raised objections are being checked and that, "if there are inaccuracies, they will be corrected."

Douglas said he expects the matter to be a subject for the WSBT editorial next week.

One of the paragraphs in the broadcast editorial to which Brademas objected contained the comment: "And in their final stroke, the bill's authors suggest that 'The government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents, but the care of the state.' "

No such language appears in the bill, Brademas noted.

In fact, a statement of "purpose" at the start of the measure says:

"Child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services . . ."

Brademas said allegations in the leaflet that the measure would permit children to sue their parents if they were punished or to organize into the equivalent of labor unions against their parents are "not only outrageous falsehoods—they are downright silly."

He said the Child and Family Services proposal is designed to provide day care services "so that working mothers and welfare mothers can be sure, while they are on the job or are looking for work, of adequate care for their children."

He said the bill would make available health services "to enable parents to get expert help in detecting physical and mental handicaps early in a child's life." Brademas added:

"I think it is significant that the bill my colleagues and I are sponsoring is supported by the AFL-CIO, the League of Women Voters, the American Bankers Association, the United Auto Workers, the United Methodist Church, the Baptist and Lutheran Churches, the National Conference of Catholic Charities and many more similar organizations."

The congressman acknowledged there are also opponents of the bill and that he expects debate about its actual provisions.

[From the Grand Rapids Press, Nov. 11, 1975]

CHILD BILL FRAUD

Despite the risk of lending unearned credence to one of the most specious and inflammatory leaflets to gain widespread distribution in the Grand Rapids area, comment must be made on a two-page publication entitled "Raising Children—Government's or Parent's Right?"

The material attacks U.S. House Bill 2966, commonly known as child and family services legislation. The proposal would expand a number of family services already provided to a limited number of persons. The proposal's stated purpose is to reduce infant mortality (the U.S. ranks 14th in this regard) and physical and mental impairments by authorizing prenatal and family health care assistance and to extend day care services beyond current Headstart programs.

Similar legislation was vetoed by President Nixon in 1971 largely on the basis of cost. At the time The Press found difficulty reconciling Mr. Nixon's demands that able persons on welfare must be made to work with his rejection of a bill which would have permitted day-care aid for a single parent who was forced to remain at home with young children.

The current legislation, similar in purpose to the 1971 bill, has been altered to meet previous criticism. First-year planning and operations would be scaled down considerably, funds would be authorized for personnel training and the bill, throughout, emphasizes and clarifies the voluntary nature of the program. Nothing in the bill makes participation mandatory, and much of the program would be directed by the parents.

The extent to which the federal government should involve itself in family services is a proper issue which can be debated responsibly. What is not responsible, however, is the distribution of emotional and patently false material which makes rational discussion all but impossible. It is the politics of freight.

The local situation is especially disturbing because the leaflet has been widely distributed in schools, churches and working places and has triggered hundreds of inquiries to Rep. Richard Vander Veen's office. It is also distressing to find that such obviously spurious information is taken seriously.

There are several elements in the two-page letter which should automatically raise doubts about its veracity. Nothing on the material identifies its source; that should be sufficient reason to discard any "fact" sheet. As proof of its allegations against the Child and Family Service Act, the letter quotes from the 1971 Congressional Record. The reference is not to the bill itself but to a speech by Sen. Carl Curtis of Nebraska who equated the legislation to a "Charter of Children's Rights."

The "charter" had been advocated, unsuccessfully, by two parties in Britain and bears no relationship to the particulars in the proposed U.S. legislation. The Congressional Record is a repository for any variety of outrageous claptrap deemed worthwhile by a member of Congress. In this case Sen. Curtis used his privilege not wisely, not responsibly, but well enough, apparently, to suit his purposes.

Finally, the purported "facts" contained in the flyer are so outlandish and totally out of character for the bill's two respected sponsors—Rep. John Brademas of Indiana and Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota—that they should be discounted out of hand.

Those who have gone on record as supporting the intent of the legislation include the Salvation Army, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, eight national Baptist organizations, the National PTA and a dozen or so organizations representing handicapped persons.

Still, the concept of expanding federal aid to poor families with pre-school children must be debated intelligently. That cannot be done, however, when certain opponents to the bill deliberately obfuscate the issue with a layer of lies and emotions.

Rep. Garry Brown of Schoolcraft opposes the legislation but nevertheless felt moved to inform his constituents that the flyers, like those distributed in Grand Rapids, contained "false and misleading information."

Rep. Vander Veen, who said he will not decide how to vote on the bill until he sees its final form, has called the discrediting material "a deliberate attempt to mislead the public."

The congressman is much too kind. The flyer is a gross form of public deception which threatens to make legitimate debate on an important issue impossible. And unfortunately, those well-meaning persons who have innocently caused its dissemination have not advanced the cause of good government.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Nov. 11, 1975]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Despite the scurrilous nature of certain charges directed against the Child and Family Services Bill, sponsored in the Senate by Sen. Walter Mondale, D-Minn., and in the House by Rep. John Brademas, D-South Bend, a question of whether the bill merits passage remains.

We have read the bill itself, in addition to a malicious assigned flyer opposing it and other arguments pro and con.

We find no evidence that the bill would lead to the "sovietization" of the education of American children, whatever that might mean. On the contrary, the message explicitly makes provisions of the bill voluntary and provides for the participation of parents in its implementation.

Its authors clearly intend it as an attempt to strengthen the family while providing services not now available to parents and children at the lower end of the economic spectrum.

The measure would provide for health, nutritional, educational and other services now available to some families but which many children who need them do not receive.

Day-care facilities, "other health, social, recreational and educational programs designed to meet the special needs of children and families," social services prenatal, and other services for expectant mothers, programs to help minority ethnic groups, food and nutritional services, help in countering medical and emotional disabilities—these are the sort of programs envisioned by the bill.

In common with much legislation intended to attack social problems, the cost would be high. The bill calls for initial appropriations of $158 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976 and $200 million in the next fiscal year for "training, technical assistance, planning, and such other activities" necessary to prepare for its implementation.

It further authorizes $500 million in the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1977 and $1 billion in the next fiscal year, subject to the appropriation of funds to carry out part A of the Headstart Follow Through Act. A portion of the funding would be on the state or local level.

Like most of the Great Society programs, including those which undeniably have worked successfully, the bill might in fact cost a great deal more than the preliminary figures indicate, once it was fully implemented.

How much of a burden to taxpayers it would become must be considered by Congress. The fiscal integrity of the United States is at stake, and new programs must be evaluated with that realization.

The Child and Family Services Bill contains some provisions that may be enacted in some form, eventually. Like national health insurance, they may have to await a time when our economy is expanding healthily, inflation is in check and our federal deficit has been brought under control.

Anyone seeing a copy of the flyer attacking the bill as "the Soviet-style system of communal child rearing" ought to treat it as any unsigned hate propaganda deserves to be treated. That, however, does not automatically mean that the measure should be voted into law at this time.

[From the Ann Arbor News, Nov. 16, 1975]

FAMILY SERVICES BILLS BEING MISREPRESENTED

One of the most time-consuming but worth-while tasks of a daily newspaper is seeking out the source of some of the irresponsible literature floating around and trying to mitigate its effects.

Recent letters to The News indicate that the Ann Arbor area is receiving some of the inflammatory leaflets that have circulated in other areas attacking House and Senate bills commonly known as child and family services legislation. In some places the leaflets have carried the title "Raising Children—Government's or Parent's Right?"

The following paragraph is an example of the material in the leaflet, allegedly taken from House bill 2966:

"As a matter of the child's rights, the governments shall exert controls over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of their parents but the care of the State. We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms. Furthermore, there is a serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children for this new kind of world which is emerging."

That, of course, does not appear in the legislation. It is quoted from the 1971 Congressional Record, which unfortunately gives an aura of legitimacy to some of the greatest nonsense to come out of Washington. Members of Congress can fill it with speeches delivered to empty halls or with views they believe will enhance their standing with constituents. The quotation above came not from the legislation but from a speech by Senator Carl Curtis of Nebraska who equated the legislation to a "Charter of Children's Rights," which had been advocated, unsuccessfully, by two parties in Britain.

How anyone could compare that "charter" with the child and family services legislation is a mystery. The legislation, vetoed in an earlier version by President Nixon because of the cost, was introduced by Rep. John Brademas of Indiana and Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota. The intent of the bills has been endorsed by such groups as the Salvation Army, the National Conference and Catholic Charities, the national PTA and eight national Baptist organizations.

The revised legislation would expand a number of family services now existing and extend day care services beyond the Headstart program, and a goal would be reduced infant mortality. The bills have been modified substantially to reduce costs. The voluntary nature of the program is emphasized throughout, contrary to what is being said in the anonymous leaflets being circulated in opposition to the legislation.

Such legislation is always subject to debate, but the debate should be based on facts and not on misinformation circulated as a scare tactic. It is difficult enough to determine the truth and even to understand some of the legislation being proposed in Lansing and Washington. It is total irresponsibility to misrepresent it.

[Memorandum, prepared by the office of Congressman Brademas, refuting attacks made in the flyers]

Memorandum

Subject: Attacks on Child and Family Services Bill

Flyers entitled: "Raising Children—Government's or Parent's Right?"

ATTACK

"There is before Congress legislation known as the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 (Senate: S262 & House: 2966). If passed it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the Government."

FACT

This bill would in no way take the responsibility for childraising away from parents. All programs authorized in the bill are (HR 2966, Sec. 2(a)(2)) "provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or guardians request such services." In addition, any practice which would "infringe or usurp the moral and legal responsibilities of parents or guardians" is specifically prohibited (Sec. 504(a)).

ATTACK

"Child Advocacy Clause. In the Congressional Record we read: 'If, in the judgment of those who are in charge of such a program (the State by way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a "specialist" appointed by the government) would enter the home and direct the education, even within the home. And, if the parent would object, the authority in the home would, DeFacto, be transferred to these advocated (sic).' "

FACT

This quotation does not appear in the Congressional Record although it appears to be a combination of a number of related statements that appear throughout the Congressional Record of December 2, 1971. However, it is categorically false to contend that: (a) such language appears in HR 2966; (b) such beliefs are held or advocated by any of the sponsors of HR 2966; or (c) that any "child advocacy clause" of any kind appears in the bill. (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below.)

ATTACK

"Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties is becoming a part of this child Development Act."

(The flyers go on to list "several items in this charter," alleging that they can "be found on page 44138 of the Congressional Record.)

FACT

No such language or "charter" has ever been proposed, included or even considered for the Child and Family Services Act or any related piece of legislation. This "charter" initially surfaced during Senate debate on December 2, 1971 on the Conference Report on the Office of Economic Opportunity Act. Senator Carl T. Curtis (R-Nebraska) said "In England, child development advocates have gone so far as to draft a charter of 'children's rights.' " Curtis continued by reading from something he called the "Charter of Children's Rights" of "the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council for Civil Liberties." Thus these so-called "rights" were never advocated by sponsors of this legislation and, in fact, the "Council" cited is not even an American organization. (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below.)

ATTACK

"Can the Government take away your children? Comprehensive child development, the Soviet-style system of communal child rearing which almost became law in this country in 1971 is once again being pushed through Congress. The current bills H.R. 2966 (House of Representatives), S. 626 (Senate), are virtually identical to the original act passed in 1971, but fortunately vetoed by the then president, Nixon. Now it is known as the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 and any changes are merely cosmetic.

"In vetoing the original bill which would have removed children from their parent's instruction shortly after birth. Mr. Nixon said that it would weaken the American family by committing 'vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family oriented approach.'

"We are in serious danger of 'Sovietizing' the education of our children if we let the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 pass. Those who support this Act in the Congress are convinced that it will 'Sail through the House.' "

FACT

These charges, made by President Nixon in vetoing the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971, are absurd and irresponsible. The sponsors of the bill have carefully drafted it to protect the rights of parents and their children:

First, participation in the program is completely voluntary. Children will not participate without the specific request of a parent or legal guardian.

Second, children will not be tested unless the parent or guardian is informed and given the opportunity to except the child from testing.

Third, the bill contains specific language providing protection against any involvement of the moral or legal right of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, or physical development of their children. (See attachment A.)

Unlike the public school program, the child and family services programs are totally voluntary.

ATTACK

"According to the Congressional Record, the intent of the bill is for the government to be responsible . . . for the nutritional interests of your child, for all psychological interests of your child."

FACT

The intent of the bill is (Sec. 2(b)) "to provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those preschool children and families with the greatest need, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decision-making at the community level, with direct participation of the [illegible]rents of the children served and other individuals and organizations in the commun[illegible]nterested in child and family service (making the best possible use of public and priv[illegible]sources), through a partnership of parents, State and local government, and the Fed[illegible]overnment, building upon the experience and success of Headstart and other existing programs." (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below.)

ATTACK

"The following excerpts are taken from the Congressional Record: 'What is at issue is whether the parent shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the state, with all its power and magnitude, shall be given the decisive tools and technique for forming the young lives of the children of this country.

'As a matter of the child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents but the care of the state (sic). We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms, Furthermore, there is serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children in this country for this new kind of world which is emerging.'

"This all smells of Communism. This is what in fact has been and is being done in Soviet Russia. This is what can become the law of our land, if the Child & Family Service Act of 1975 is passed by the Congress. We elected this Congress, but do we know what they are attempting to do to our freedoms and our rights?"

FACT

These citations do not appear in the Congressional Record. In fact, they are diametrically opposed to the purpose and intent of the bill.

First, the programs are completely voluntary.

Second, the precisely stated purposes of the legislation is to "strengthen family life,"not weaken it.

Third, the program is to be operated locally, not by the national government.

Fourth, specific prohibitions against any practice infringing on the rights and responsibilities of parents are contained in the bill (Sec. 504(a)). (See "Special Note on the Congressional Record" below.)

SPECIAL NOTE ON THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Throughout this leaflet, the "Congressional Record" is cited. The Congressional Record has the ring of an official pronouncement to it. But anyone who has ever even glanced at the Record knows that it contains not only the debates in the House of Representatives and Senate but also speeches and material simply "inserted" into the Record. Any Member of Congress has the right to insert material in the Record and therefore the assertion that a statement is "according to the Congressional Record" is meaningless since the Record itself makes no statement of policy. Policy statements are made by the Members of Congress quoted in the Record.

This flyer provides a good example of the abuse of the citation of the Congressional Record. Senator Curtis of Nebraska included as part of his remarks on a bill considered by Congress in 1971 some material which he attributed to an organization in a foreign country. By misleading citation, the flyer implies that this material appeared in the Congressional Record this year and that it represents the contents of the bill. The bill's chief sponsor in the House had never before seen this material.

[Memorandum, prepared by the office of Congressman Brademas, listing key points about the Child and Family Services Act]

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Key Points About the Child & Family Services Act

1. Purpose of the Bill: "Provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services . . . in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decisionmaking at the community level." (HR 2966, Sec. 2(b).)

2. No Interference with Parental Rights and Responsibilities.

First, participation in the program is completely voluntary; children will not participate without the specific request of a parent or legal guardian. (Sec. 2(a)(2).)

Second, any practice which would "infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal responsibilities or parents or guardians" is specifically prohibited. (Sec. 504(a).)

Third, no research or experimentation can be conducted with any child without the knowledge of a parent or guardian and the parent or guardian can refuse permission of the child to participate. (Sec. 504(b).)

Fourth, no medical or psychological examination or treatment can be administered to any child without the written permission of a parent or guardian. (Sec. 504(c).)

3. Programs run at the local, not federal, level. Although the funding for the programs will be provided from the Federal government, all administration of the programs will be by state or local sponsors. (Sec. 104.)

In addition, each sponsor must have an advisory council made up of parents and of people recommended by parents. This advisory council plays an important policymaking role under the bill. (Sec. 105.)

4. The bill has broad bi-partisan support. The legislation has always enjoyed broad bi-partisan support. Among the current sponsors are Republicans Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts, Peter Peyser of New York and Larry Pressley of South Dakota; Democrats John Brademas of Indiana, Carl Perkins of Kentucky and George Miller of California.

The bill is similar to provisions recently advocated by a Republican Congressional task force and by both parties in their platforms at their 1972 National Conventions.

5. The bill is supported by a wide range of respected organizations. Among the long list of national organizations supporting the legislation are these:

American Academy of Pediatrics.
United States Catholic Conference.
National Council of Jewish Women AFL-CIO.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.
American Association of University Women.
League of Women Voters.
National Council of Churches.
United Methodist Church.
United Auto Workers.
National League of Cities.
American Bankers Association.
Common Cause.
Urban League.

6. Opponents have been conducting a nasty smear campaign against the bill. Here are some of the tactics that the extreme right wing groups opposing this legislation have been using against this legislation:

(a) Forming Committees with high-sounding names (e.g., National Coalition for Children) which merely operate out of the offices of existing radical right groups.

(b) Distributing usaigned elaflets calling the bill "communism."

(c) These unsigned flyers make various references to material appearing in the Congressional Record as though it were the words of the supporters of the legislation. In fact, group of Senators who are opposed to the bill.

(d) The flyers and, subsequent editorial comment, contend that some absolutely wild provisions are contained in the bill. Not only do the provisions not appear in the language of the bill, they turn out, after investigation, to be items taken from a document published by a foreign group in England.

(e) Many critics of the bill hav not even read the bill.

STATEMENTS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN RESPONSE TO THE PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

[From Congressional Record, Apr. 1, 1976]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

(By Hon. Gillis W. Long of Louisiana, in the House of Representatives)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have received hundreds of letters in recent months expressing concern over the Child and Family Services Act.

People everywhere are disturbed and frightened over reports that this bill will take the responsibility for child rearing from the hands of parents and put it in the hands of Goverment.

For the most part, these are fears based on information circulated through a single, unsigned flyer which purports to describe the bill's content. In fact, it does not.

To me it is incomprehensible that someone—anyone—would want to deliberately mislead thousands of Americans with false information on an issue so important. Clearly there is ample room for realistic debate on the question of expanding child development programs in this country.

The impact of the recent propaganda campaign has pointed up an aspect of our legislative process today that warrants serious consideration. That is the potential for a proliferation of "canned" material which oversimplifies, or otherwise distorts issues in a world where problems are becoming increasingly complex.

The one bright note in all this has been the diligence of many members of the press in digging beneath the surface to discover the truth and set the record straight so people can make informed judgments on legislation affecting them.

Such an editorial was recently written by Ms. Helen Derr, religion editor of the Daily Town Talk in Alexandria, La. It is an example of the kind of responsible journalism that is key to our form of participatory democracy, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the public:

ATTACKS ON "CHILD SERVICES" BILL

(By Helen Derr)

It isn't so!

The Child and Family Services Act of 1975 now in Congress is not going to take over our children. Big Brother isn't yet ready to enter our homes and tell us we can't spank the kids.

The bill in question, Senate Bill 626 and H.R. 2966 (the same bill), was authored by Sen. Walter Mondale (D.-Minn.) and Rep. John Brademas (D.-Ind.).

Like many of you, I've been getting requests to help disseminate information about this bill's efforts to "nationalize" our children.

I've heard it discussed at social gatherings and warned against on television.

The bill, say its critics, will give children "the right of protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents of authority . . . the right to freedom from religious and political indoctrination . . . freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents or others without fear of reprisals."

Also quoted is what is called a "child advocacy clause" which would allow the state to send an advocate into the home if it feels the parents are not doing a good job.

It isn't so!

Always the skeptic, I began asking about the bill and found its critics quoting only from the Congressional Record or other sources. No one—repeat, no one—was quoting the bill itself!

So I called Congressman Gillis Long's Alexandria office for information which they assured me I would get. A few days later I got a copy of H.R. 2966.

I've read it, ladies and gentlemen. So help me, I've read the bill's entire 71 pages!

It has no Child Advocacy Clause. There is nothing in it about taking over your children or mine.

The bill is a proposal to make available federal funds for states and communities to provide certain public services for children and their families; it has to do mainly with funding day-care centers for working mothers. That's it!

There is a lot of money involved and the bill probably will not become law in this election year.

But there's more at stake.

Portions of several Congressional Records sent to me by Congressman Long's staff indicate the bill is the victim of a "vicious and dishonest campaign against it."

Inserted into the Congressional Record of Dec. 1, 1975, is the text of the unsigned flier which contains the charges that have been reproduced in countless secular and church papers throughout the United States.

Analysis of the flier by the Library of Congress shows that virtually all of the statements in it were arguments of senators and others who were against the bill when it was first introduced in 1971. They are not in the bill now; they never were!

At least two radio stations in the country have had to make public retractions after having used the flier material on broadcasts and have had to admit their personnel did not read the bill itself but were relying on the flier's misinformation.

U.S. News and World Report has printed a rebuttal to the charges, Baptist Press released a story on this falsity, the Methodist Reporter and many other papers have carried stories and editorials on the misinformation.

But it continues.

Where do these insidious attacks come from? The authors of the infamous flier, whoever they are, know they're telling lies. Do they want to create division and loss of faith in our country?

And why are we so ready to believe these attacks without checking more carefully?

Have we lost all faith in our government or are we just apathetic?

Government is big and complicated, but we can find out what's going on.

I spent only a few hours getting the bill, reading it and reading the charges.

But I know for sure now.

The charges just aren't so!

[From Congressional Record, Mar. 4, 1976]

THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975—S. 626

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be identified with day care legislation, and as ranking minority member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and chief cosponsor of S. 626, the Child and Family Services Act of 1975, I remain firm in my belief that services available to young children and their families are inadequate to meet the present need. The proposed legislation would fund a variety of quality child and family services, including, day care programs, part day and full day, parenthood education, and nutrition.

While I am a supporter of this legislation, I recognize that in previous sessions there has been much debate in the Congress, and that many issues still are not resolved. However, the recent barrage of mail which I have been receiving, and to which my colleagues have also been subjected, removes the basic issues from reality. Instead, specious and unfounded claims are seemingly accepted as truth by those who have received and circulated an unsigned leaflet. This leaflet attributes and quotes a child advocacy clause which is nonexistent in the legislation. False allegations, inaccuracies, and distortions are the mainstays of this concerted effort to arouse the ire of the people. Regrettably too few can take the time and effort to investigate and challenge the issues of fact before adding their voices in criticism.

The proposed legislation recognizes and specifically provides that child care programs must be totally voluntary. Its purpose is to build upon and strengthen the role of the family as the primary and fundamental influence on the development of the child. Suggestions that child rearing authority would vest in the State, or that parents would be prohibited from providing religious training to their children, are clearly refuted by the endorsement of this legislation by religious organizations across the country.

Support for additional child and family services, and testimony concerning the increasing need as more women enter the labor force, has been repeated often in the many days of hearings held during the past year. An unfinished task remains to inform the people on the need for comprehensive services for the American family. As this is accomplished such campaigns based as we are experiencing, will not have a chance to gain currency.

[From Congressional Record, Mar. 3, 1976]

THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE ACT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Danielson). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Bob Wilson) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **BOB WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of the House, I have recently heard, by mail and telephone, from hundreds of concerned constituents who have received an anonymous flyer relative to H.R. 2966/S. 626, the Child and Family Services Act. This flyer makes a number of inaccurate statements about the contents of the legislation, and I would like to take a few minutes to clarify the real issues involved. I have a number of concerns relative to H.R. 2966/S. 626, and think our debate should center on the legitimate issues involved, not a scare campaign fostered by unsigned circulars.

Let me cite a few examples. The flyer states that the Child and Family Services Act incorporates the Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties and that this fact is substantiated on page 44138—no year given—of the Congressional Record. The item in question is apparently a portion of a speech by Senator Curtis from the Congressional Record of December 2, 1971. The Senator was expressing his concern over the conference report on S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments, and what it might portend for the future. As an example, the Senator cited the Charter of Children's Rights prepared by the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council for Civil Liberties. This was prepared by a British group and has nothing to do with anything going on in the United States. This charter is not a part of H.R. 2966/S. 626, and advocates of this legislation have made it clear that they would never accept such a proposal.

Likewise, the bill contains no "Child Advocacy Clause," as the unsigned "fact sheet" also alleges. In fact, the bill instead makes every effort to assure parents of their primary responsibility for the welfare of their children. Section 2(a) states:

> The Congress finds that—(1) the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children; (2) child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services. . . .

Section 504 further clarifies that:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law.

If the "fact sheet" is erroneous, then what are the real issues involved in the Child and Family Services Act? The answer is simple. First and foremost is money. This legislation envisions the expenditure of $1.8 billion dollars over a 3-year period for Federal funding of day care centers. We are all more than aware of the constant demands on the Federal Treasury at this time and the truly staggering dimensions of the Federal deficit. Where are we going to come up with this additional $2 billion? Should it be spent at all? What are the alternative demands for this same money: Elementary and secondary education, health research, defense, public works, social security, interest on the national debt?

In addition to financial considerations, there is also a major policy determination at stake here. Is this a proper undertaking for the Federal Government or should the question of day care aid be left to the States and localities? Will the program overlap existing Federal assistance to the States which is used for day care services to poverty-level working mothers? Is there really a large-scale public interest in massive Federal funding for day care?

What about the administration of the program? The regulations will come from the HEW bureaucracy in Washington. It is not difficult to predict the redtape of nightmarish proportions which will result. Based on past experiences, it is doubtful that effective regulations can be formulated to meet the diverse child care needs of our 50 States. In short, should the Federal Government be in the day care business?

It is not my intention to play "Twenty Questions" with the other Members of the House, but merely to point out the many questions which are raised by H.R. 2966 and S. 626. I feel it is paramount that our debate center on what this legislation actually proposes; namely, major Federal expenditures for preschool child care programs, not on an anonymous scare campaign that our children and grandchildren are going to be wrenched from us by the Government. I cannot support H.R. 2966 and S. 626, because of the cost and policy questions I have recently discussed.

I know that many other Members oppose the legislation on similar grounds. Let us, however, defeat the bill on rational grounds such as these, and not because of a mass hysteria campaign of unknown origin.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 26, 1976]

Panic Over the Child and Family Services Act

(By Hon. David F. Emery of Maine in the House of Representatives)

Mr. Emery. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention an editorial by Howard Flieger in the March 1, 1976, issue of U.S. News & World Report, outlining the incredible fear campaign being waged throughout the country against H.R. 2966, the Child and Family Services Act. Many of my constituents, out of concern for the welfare of their children, have written me about this bill. These people do not understand the intricacies of the legislative process, and are not remotely familiar with either the bill's contents or its sponsors. They have been horribly misled and cruelly frightened by a fanatic campaign designed to convince parents that they will surely lose influence over their children, and that their moral and religous standards will be dictated by the Government.

Certainly, no responsible Congressman would ever support such a bill if it existed. The point is, it does not.

There are many reasons why I could not support the Child and Family Services Act in its present form—the expense is simply too great for this Congress to fund. However, I am appalled at the many untruths that have been circulated about this bill. I believe that legislative decisions must be based on facts and not on hysteria.

The editorial follows:

False Alarm

(By Howard Flieger)

Every now and then a reader writes us in words of terror to warn that a Marxist plot is afoot in Congress to "nationalize" our children—take them away from the protection or control of their parents and destroy the American family, utterly and forever.

The volume of mail received here is not a patch on the sacks of it that have been hitting some congressional offices.

The writers are alarmed over what they've been informed is an insidious scheme to give youngsters the legal right to disobey their parents, and thus become pawns of Government—an all-powerful Big Brother to mold their training, conduct and beliefs.

Strange.

It is strange because there isn't a word of truth in it. No such legislation is before this Congress, or ever has been.

The specific bill that has so many people disturbed is "The Child and Family Services Act of 1975." Its authors are Sen. Walter Mondale (Dem.), of Minnesota, and Rep John Brademas (Dem.), of Indiana. It is "S. 626" in the Senate, "H.R. 2966" in the House. Read it before you panic.

In its present form, the legislation is both innocent and impotent: innocent because it would do none of the things attributed to it; impotent because it isn't going anywhere.

Briefly stated, the proposal is to make federal funds available to help States and communities provide certain public services for children and their families.

These would include such things as pre-natal care, food where needed, part of full-time day care for children of working mothers, tutoring at home where deemed useful, medical examination and treatment for certain handicapped children, and training for parents and about-to-be-parents.

There is nothing compulsory about the legislation now before the Congress. Even if the bill were enacted, anyone who felt like it could ignore each and all of its provisions.

Nothing in it says—or implies—that youngsters have a legal right to disobey their parents or guardians.

Nowhere does it forbid parental guidance, advice or preference in religious training. The subject isn't mentioned.

In fact, it says in specific words:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed or applied in such manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents."

So why all the excitement? It is puzzling to Senator Mondale, one of the chief sponsors, who says the measure "is being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

There is another practical thing to keep in mind about The Child and Family Service Act: It would cost a lot of money. Estimates are that an initial annual expense of 150 million dollars would grow to almost 2 billion by the third year of operation.

This present Congress is in no mood to add such a burden on taxpayers who already are making angry noises about waste and the high cost of Government. Since this is election year, the measure probably has less chance now than a year ago, when it was introduced—and that means practically none.

Also, remember the President is demanding that Congress do more to hold the line on spending. It is a keystone of his campaign to be against this bill, and any like it.

So everybody can stand at ease.

The bill doesn't provide all those wild things the letter-writers fear. It has no realistic chance of adoption. And even should it overcome its rating as one of the longest shots in history and somehow be enacted by Congress, it would be vetoed almost the minute it reached the White House.

The furor is a false alarm. Forget it.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 23, 1970]

INTERRELIGIOUS STATEMENT ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. Matsunaga) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have received numerous inquiries from my constituents regarding H.R. 2966, the child and family services bill, as a result of a pervasive, but anonymous, campaign directed against this bill. Since I am a cosponsor of H.R. 2966, the serious charges made against this bill are a source of great concern to me. If H.R. 2966 in fact contained any of the provisions detailed in the hate campaign literature, I certainly would not have added my name to it as a cosponsor.

I would like to reiterate by commitment to the basic principle behind H.R. 2966: That the American family will be strengthened by the availability of health, education, and other services which might not otherwise be affordable. The child care, prenatal health care, aid for handicapped children, and food and nutrition programs are all designed to enable families to provide for their children the best possible environment regardless of financial limitations. These programs are all voluntary, but I think we can all agree that the services covered are crucial to the well-being of all children.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ recently provided me a copy of a recent "Interreligious Statement on the Child and Family Services Bill," issued by many national religious organizations. In an effort to present the truth about H.R. 2966, I am requesting that this statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

INTERRELIGIOUS STATEMENT ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

In December of 1971 both the House and the Senate passed the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. Supported by a coalition of poverty and civil rights groups, labor unions, women's gruops, churches, educators, and community and citizens organizations, the bill would have amended Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act "to provide every child (through age 14) with a fair and full opportunity to reach his full potential by establishing and expanding comprehensive child development programs." This bill was vetoed by President Nixon.

In February of 1975, Sen. Mondale (D-Minn.) introduced a very similar bill, S. 626, The Child and Family Services Act of 1975. Rep. Brademas (D-Ind.) introduced a companion bill (H.R. 2966) in the House. This bill would establish programs of part-day and full-day child care, prenatal care, special services for minority group children, food and nutrition programs, aid for handicapped children, and various types of assistance to families with special needs.

The Child and Family Services Act is now under attack by groups and individuals charging that it would give government undue authority over family life. In fact, some groups have charged that the proposed legislation would make the "government responsible for . . . the religious interests of your child," give "children the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents," and make preschool education "compulsory" for all children beginning at age three.

These charges are totally inaccurate. There is nothing in this legislation that relates to religious preferences or religious instruction; nothing that relates to or alters the existing legal relationship between parents and their children; and nothing that provides for compulsory preschool education, or for compulsory service of any kind.

What it seeks to do instead is to strengthen and support families in their efforts to provide their children—on a totally voluntary basis—with the basic health, education and other services they want for them but too often cannot afford. Thus, it authorizes funding for a variety of child and family services including prenatal health care, medical treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions, and day care services for children of working parents.

Most importantly, any and all of these programs are totally voluntary, and limited to children whose parents request the services. Parent control is further assured by requirements that all programs would be selected, established and controlled by parents whose children participate in them.

A careful reading of the bill reveals that it will support families, not weaken them. The bill states, for example, the "family is the primary and most-fundamental influence on children" and that "child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family."

The need for legislation of this kind is clear. The infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than that of thirteen other nations. Each year an estimated 200,000 children are struck by handicaps which could have been prevented if their mothers had received early health care. Forty percent of the young children of this country are not fully immunized against childhood diseases. Sixty-five percent of all handicapped preschool children are not receiving special services. There are only one million spaces in licensed day care homes and centers to serve the six million preschool children whose parents are working.

Debate over legislative proposals such as this Child and Family Services Act should be based on the facts, and decided on the merits. To do otherwise—to misrepresent the purpose and provisions of the legislation under discussion—is a disservice to all Americans concerned about families and children.

American Jewish Committee: Ms. Anne Wolfe, Director, Social Welfare.
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ Disciples Peace Fellowship).
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Department of Church in Society, Division of Homeland Ministries.
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office.
Friends Committee on National Legislation Lutheran Family and Children's Services, St. Louis, Missouri.
Lutheran Welfare Services of Illinois.
Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota.
National Council of Churches.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Council of Jewish Women: Mrs. Esther R. Landa, National President.
Network.
Synagogue Council of America.
Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates, Camp Hill, Pa.
United Church of Christ Center for Social Action.
United Methodist Church, Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries.
United Presbyterian Church, USA, Washington Office.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 18, 1976]

SOME THOUGHTS ON S. 626

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, parents all over Utah are angry and frightened about legislation in Congress entitled "The Child and Family Services Act." Hundreds have written to me or called my office in protest. They are convinced that Congress is about to take away their authority over their children. This hysteria seems to be largely the product of a single anonymous "fact sheet" which quotes extensively, and out of context, from a 1971 Senate debate and completely misrepresents the purpose and provisions of the present bill. Normally responsible institutions and news media have distributed this document without attempting to confirm or deny its allegations.

Scare campaigns of this sort turn serious debates into ideological shouting matches and, worse, destroy trust in public officials. I am shocked how many people seriously believe that Congress would enact a law giving children the legal right to disobey their parents, or prohibiting parents from providing religious training to their children, or giving the Government authority to say how they should be reared, or allowing children to sue their parents for exercising discipline.

These charges are completely false. The Senate bill, S. 626, specifically states that "the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children" and the purpose of the bill is to "build upon and strengthen the role of the family." It offers health, education, and child care services to needy families on a totally voluntary basis. No one would be compelled or pressured to participate. Parents would select and control all programs funded by the act; they would be operated locally, not by the Federal government.

S. 626 also declares that "nothing in this act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians." It does not contain, and the sponsors never contemplated, a "charter of children's rights," nor a "child advocacy" clause, nor any restriction on religious training.

The real issues are whether the Federal Government can afford to take on these new responsibilities of funding day care and to whom these services should be provided. The bill authorizes expenditures of up to $1.8 billion in the next 3 years. I do not believe that present budget constraints will permit the adoption of such an expensive social program. Congress is determined to restrain Federal spending in order to control the budget deficit and to reduce inflation; and I support these efforts as a member of the Senate Budget Committee. There is also a reasonable question of the future whether the Government should heavily subsidize services to middle-class families in addition to helping the poor in need.

Fortunately, a few broadcasters and newspapers are beginning to expose the deception and tell the public the facts. One editorial recently observed that one of the most tedious but important tasks of the news media is to seek out the source of irresponsible literature and try to mitigate its effects. I am convinced that the public will listen and form their own opinions.

A woman in Granger, Utah, wrote to me last month concerning S. 626:

> I would like you to know that I am opposed to legislation which has been introduced in the House or Senate to infringe on the authority of parents in the home . . . I expect you as my representative to actively fight any such legislation in the future.

In my response, I sent a copy of the bill and asked for her judgment after a careful reading of its provisions. She wrote back:

> Thank you for sending a copy of S. 626 to me. I can see nothing in it that threatens the authority of parents over their children. My only regret, after reading it, is that the Federal government apparently must take responsibility . . . Individuals and groups in the nation close their eyes, ears and hearts to the needs of those who may be less fortunate than their own.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 10, 1976]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

(By Hon. Bud Shuster of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been inundated over the past several weeks with letters and phone calls from constituents expressing their deep concern with implications in H.R. 2966, the Child and Family Services Act. Because of this outcry, I have devoted a considerable amount of time researching this legislation and have prepared a statement relating to it. I am inserting this statement in the Record and offering it for consideration by my colleagues:

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT: SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By Congressman Bud SHUSTER)

There is an expensive and dangerous bill now awaiting action by the House, a bill which has generated more controversy and produced more mail than any other in the time I have been in Congress. I am referring to the infamous Child and Family Services Act, a bad piece of legislation which deserves to be overwhelming defeated.

I am opposed to this bill, and intend to fight it all the way. But I am concerned that many people misunderstand the real reasons for alarm. A great deal of misinformation about this measure has been circulated, and in this article I hope to set the record straight.

The Child and Family Services Act would provide Federal funding for conprehensive new child care programs, set standards for existing programs, and coordinate the activities of child care agencies to avoid overlapping of functions. Through this legislation, the Federal Government would attempt to provide guidance for the social, physical, nutritional, and psychological development of the child, in standardized daycare center settings.

The introduction of this type of legislation breaks no new ground. Federal money has been involved with child development programs in one form or another since 1935—in Social Security, Project Headstart the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, CETA, the School Lunch Program, and a variety of other Federal agencies.

Legislation virtually identical to the Child and Family Services Act was passed by both Houses of Congress in 1971, but was subsequently vetoed by President Nixon. In his veto message, he stated that, although the intent of the bill—to provide every child with a full and fair opportunity to reach his own potential—was laudable, the intent was overshowaded by the fiscal irresponsibility and family-weakening implications of the system it envisioned. He said:

"For the Federal Government to plunge headlong financially into supporting child development would commit the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of communal approaches to child-rearing over against the family-centered approach."

In saying this, I think President Nixon fairly summarized the feelings of many who believe that the Federal Government should not expend so dramatically its support of public daycare programs. Oppostition to such expansion stems from either the desire to let privately-run institutions provide daycare, or from the belief that the government simply should not encourage more mothers to work while leaving their children in daycare centers of any kind.

Both objections are fair; both are subject to rational discussion and debate, and both apply with equal force to the legislation now before the Congress.

But there is a new, and disturbing strain of criticism relating to the 1975 legislation. It has been promoted behind the scenes, by unknown individuals or organizations, and has muddled the legitimate debate on this bill.

Many good people—God-fearing people who care about their children—have been led to believe by this propaganda campaign that the Child and Family Services Act will allow the government to take children from their homes and raise them in communes, or that government-sponsored "advocates" will enter the home and evaluate the ability of parents to raise their children.

One rumor that has gained much currency is that this bill contains a "Charter of Children's Rights" asserting, among other things, that children have the right to freedom from political or religious indoctrination. The alleged "Charter" also claims that "all children have the right of protection from * * * the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds. (Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back to you with a civil suit.)"

There are no such provisions in this bill. In the flyers denouncing the bill, where these supposed sections are quoted, what is not mentioned is that these "rights" are lifted from suggestions made by a British study group early in this decade, never passed—even in Great Britain—and never introduced at any time into legislation before the United States Congress.

There is a real disservice being done here. The Child and Family Services Act is a bad bill, not because it will "Sovietize" our children, not because it will allow children to control their parents, rather than vice-versa, but because it is badly structured, too costly, and too vague to enact into law. To ignore the truly bad aspects of this bill, and concentrate on the myths that surround it, makes all opponents of the legislation look less serious than they are.

Let us examine some of the ways in which the Child and Family Services Act fails to accomplish its goals:

1. STRUCTURE

The primary change at the Federal level is the creation of an "Office of Child and Family Services", which would supplant the present HEW Office of Child Development. Also an, interagency "Child and Family Services Coordinating Council" would be established.

At the local level, Federal grants would be provided to states, cities, counties, school boards or other local units that set up comprehensive day-care programs. These "prime sponsors" would be subject to Federal standards in all phases of operation. Local program councils, consisting of parents of daycare and Headstart children, as well as representatives of the general public, would serve as the ongoing administrative bodies for these local operations.

One must ask, though, whether the addition of another complex bureaucracy to the sprawling Health, Education, and Welfare maze would aid either parents or children in the long run. It would certainly move the Federal Government one step farther into the lives of our people and the operations of facilities that are probably best left under local control.

Another disturbing facet of the structure of his bill is its primary underlying assumption. It blithely asserts that the government will work in "partnership" with parents. I cannot recall a Constitutional provision giving the government the authority to declare itself legally a partner with parents in the raising of children.

2. LANGUAGE

One of the most alarming features of this bill is, simply, the way it is written. It deals in broad, generic terms with areas that have always been treated carefully and precisely. It makes dangerously vague pronouncements about child and family life, subjects that should be handled delicately by the government, if at all.

Just read some of the bill's language, and think of the potential for misuse of the law's power:

Sec. 201c(2)e. "The Secretary shall . . . appoint a Special Committee on Federal Standards for Child Care . . . Such committee shall participate in the development of Federal standards for child care and modifications thereof . . ."

Although this section refers, supposedly, to Federally-assisted agencies, does it not suggest the possibility of a Federal committee setting standards applicable in the home as well as in daycare centers? Nothing in this language prevents such a construction.

Sec. 401. "Congress recognizes . . . that parents can be helped effectively to use child service methods with their own children that will lessen the need for compensatory education programs for older children."

Despite the voluntary nature of parents' participation in the services offered by this bill, Section 401 sounds ominous—since it virtually urges parents to adopt the child care techniques used in daycare centers.

Reading further, Section 403 authorizes the HEW Secretary to make grants and enter into contracts to "help parents and high school students understand and practice sound child care techniques." I seriously question the right of the HEW Secretary, or any other governmental agency, to promote one kind of child care method over another. This smacks of Big Brother, whether the bill's framers intended that connotation or not.

One final instance I find, in which the language of this bill, by overstatement and imprecision, raises the possibility of more Federal involvement in family matters than is justified.

In "Definitions", under Title V, the word "program", used numerous times to specify a covered activity, is defined ". . . any program, service *or activity* (emphasis added), which is conducted full- or part-time in the home, in schools, or in child care facilities?

This speaks for itself.

3. PARENTAL RIGHTS GUARANTEES

Two sections in the Child and Family Services Act guarantee to parents the ultimate right of sovereignty in the home and in the control of their children. The introductory clauses state, "The family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children. . . . Child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family."

Toward its conclusion, the bill contains a strict prohibition against governmental interference with parents' rights: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents . . ." (Sec. 504).

But how seriously can we take these admonitions, when in another section the bill defines 'parent" as merely "any person who has primary day-to-day responsibility for any child"?

And how much attention can be paid to these prohibitions when the rest of the bill repeatedly opens the door to increased governmental interference with the parental role?

We have seen many times how Federal guidelines, well-intentioned though they were, have resulted in nothing more than increased governmental meddling. I fear that this Act would fail to heed its own warnings, and permit the government to legally intervene in the American family.

4. COST

My last major objection is perhaps my strongest. This bill projects a Federal outlay of $1.8 billion through 1978 in support of the various bureaucracies it establishes. But that is only the beginning.

Before he left office, former HEW Secretary Casper Weinberger estimated that the Child and Family Services Act would wind up costing a minimum of *$14 billion* per year!

At a time when we are making desperate attempts to cut unemployment and hold down inflation by reducing Federal spending, it would be the height of irresponsibility to point the Federal Government in the direction of wild new outlays for a new, and in my view, unneeded social program. Philosophical objections aside, the plain fact is that we just can't afford it.

We should be eliminating bureaucracies, not creating new ones. We should be reducing the government's influence on the lives of individuals, not announcing new standards and regulations. We should be decentralizing authority and giving people more power over their lives—not decreeing from Washington how children are to be raised.

I do not question the motives of those who drafted the Child and Family Services Act. They are well-intentioned Americans. But, the rhetoric and the propaganda aside, we have reason to be deeply concerned about the unintentional effects of this kind of legislation.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 5, 1976]

THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

(By Hon. Thad Cochran of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have received a high volume of mail and numerous telephone calls from citizens in my home State of Mississippi expressing their strong opposition to the Child and Family Services Act which is H.R. 2966, and its companion bill in the Senate, S. 626.

These expressions of sentiment should not be taken lightly by the Congress. One reason for taking this time on the floor is to insure that citizen opinion is brought to the attention of this House.

Many of my constituents have been informed that if this legislation should pass, the responsibility of parents for raising their own children would be taken away and placed instead in the control of bureaucrats in a new Office of Child and Family Services in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On the other hand, the proponents of the bill emphasize that the bill would only provide additional day-care and health services for children and that all aspects of the program are voluntary.

My constituents have been further advised that this legislation would establish within the Department of HEW a child advocacy arm that would lead to appointment of specialists empowered to enter homes and direct the education of children where it had been determined by the Government—HEW—that the parents had not been providing proper training or had been indoctrinating their children in a particular religious or moral belief that is contrary to what HEW has decided to be proper.

The proponents of this legislation, however, point out that there is no language in the bill that could even be remotely interpreted as leading to the establishment of such a child advocacy function within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The proponents further argue that this bill contains specific provisions that prohibit the infringement upon or ursurpation of the moral and legal responsibilities of parents and guardians regarding their children.

From my review and research in response to this issue, I have found that there has been an apparently widespread distribution of misleading information regarding the provisions of this bill. Most of the objection raised by constituents in their communications with me have cited language that is not contained in the bill.

However, I believe that some of the fears expressed in regard to the supposed or intended implications of this legislation should not be considered as though they were based only on inaccurate information. It seems obvious to me that there is a very sound reason for the strong sentiment among my constituents, and I expect among those of a great many of my colleagues, and I join them in the opposition to the continued expansion of the Federal Government's role into every nook and cranny of the daily lives of the individual citizen in this country. We have seen in recent years an expansion of Government regulation that has stifled individual initiative and in its place encouraged, and in some cases forced, the average citizen to look to Government at the Federal level for answers to all his problems. This is not good.

The Child and Family Services Act, in my view, is another example of the attempt to provide a Federal solution to what is and always has been primarily a family responsibility—the proper upbringing of children as individuals within their own family units without interference from Washington, or anyone else for that matter. There are abundant State laws which protect the rights of children.

I believe that any additional health services that may be needed, which this bill seeks to provide, are best determined at the local level with financial support being derived, as needed, from block grants such as revenue sharing funds. In the Congress we should strive to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy and use the resulting savings to increase our revenue sharing payments to local governments or reduce the Federal tax burden to allow more flexibility for local initiatives.

I believe the controversy surrounding the Child and Family Services Act points up what recent polls would tend to confirm—the American taxpayer is tired of paying through the nose for inefficient and wasteful programs, and would instead prefer less Government and bureaucratic controls, from the Federal level in particular. The proponents of H.R. 2966 are probably acting in what they believe to be a legitimate cause to provide additional services to children and families. However, their assurances that the language of the bill would provide no cause for alarm like that expressed by many citizens of my district, gives me little solace when I consider the numerous instances of continually expanding and meddling regulations that have come about in recent years that were likewise based on well intended legislation.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 5, 1976]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Edwards) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my office has been among the many on Capitol Hill to receive hundreds of letters and petitions from persons opposing the proposed Child and Family Services Act.

First, let me make it emphatically clear that I am opposed to this bill. It is bad legislation and I urge each of you to do all you can to kill this bill in committee. I am encouraged by the report that the Education and Labor Committee has decided to postpone hearings on this subject. I hope that our colleagues over on the Senate side will make the same decision.

There has been a lot of misinformation being circulated in south Alabama and throughout the country about this legislation. A so-called fact sheet being mailed to religious and civic leaders claims, among other things, that the bill would remove the family's right of authority over the child, would make children totally independent, and would place children under the care of the State. The mimeographed sheet goes on to quote the Congressional Record as saying a Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties would be a part of the Child Development Act.

While it is true that a certain part of the quote did appear in the Congressional Record, those who wrote the mimeographed sheet failed to mention this quote, and several others attributed to the Congressional Record, are not part of H.R. 2966 or the Senate equivalent, S. 626. Actually, the quotes were taken from speeches that were not even referring to anything ongoing in the United States.

The speakers were referring to the rights of a child as outlined in the Charter of Children's Rights of the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council for Civil Liberties.

There are enough legitimate reasons for me to oppose this bill. President Nixon vetoed a similar bill back in 1971 on grounds that "the intent of the act was overshadowed by the fiscal irresponsibility, administrative unworkability and family-weakening implications." The same holds true of the present act.

The proposed act would duplicate existing Federal, State, and local legislation and programs. Presently, Federal child care assistance is available from some 50 or more Federal sources.

The act not only duplicates these existing authorities and programs, but it does so without attempting to pull them together legislatively.

Simply put, this bill calls for a number of services for the child and the family that are already in existence and nowhere does it address itself to where funds will be found to pay for the new program. In fact, it prohibits reduction in State and local spending for child care.

This legislation has no place in a society such as ours and I will continue to do all possible to see that it does not become law.

[From Congressional Record, Feb. 4, 1976]

MISINFORMATION ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, during the past weeks my office and those of my colleagues have received several inquiries about the Child and Family Services Act, S. 626. I oppose the bill, and I intend to vote against it if it reaches the Senate floor.

But some of the material being used in a current nationwide attack on this legislation is based on utterly false assumptions. I believe the bill is wrong, but I am sorry to see it attacked on false and fictitious grounds. It is for that reason that I think other Members of the Senate—and those who are opposed to the bill—might be interested in reading an informative article in the Washington Star that sets many of these misconceptions straight.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article to be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 3, 1976]

FOES OF FAMILY SERVICES BILL SOUND A LOUD FALSE ALARM

(By Martha Angle)

From all over the country, the mail is flooding Capitol Hill—angry, frightened, sometimes hysterical letters from parents convinced that Congress is about to strip them of control over their own children.

"Are you people out of your minds? If you want children, have your own—but keep your hands off mine." one mother from Salem, Ore., told Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn.

"How completely outrageous that a country founded on freedom should presume that they have the right to take the freedom of training children from the parents," wrote an Edinboro, Pa., couple.

"Why would Congress pass such an absurd bill? Aren't most of the congressmen family men?" asked a Lincoln, Ark., couple.

What these and most of the letters now swamping House and Senate offices have in common is a total misconception of the legislation they are protesting.

The bill which has generated all the uproar is the proposed Child and Family Services Act, sponsored by Mondale and Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind. It is a revised version of legislation approved by Congress in 1971, but vetoed by then-President Richard M. Nixon.

Except for the fact that it does, indeed, deal with social services for children and their families, the measure bears no resemblance whatever to the catalog of horrors which produced the flood mail now inundating Capitol Hill.

Furthermore, the legislation is going nowhere in the current Congress, so the opponents are beating a horse already dead on its feet.

Although 12 days of joint House-Senate hearings were held on the bill last year, Mondale and Brademas both concede that tight budgetary constraints virtually preclude adoption of an expensive new social program at this time.

What has apparently touched off the deluge of protest mail is the widespread distribution, in chain-letter fashion, of anonymous mimeographed scare literature purporting to describe the contents of the Mondale-Brademas bill.

Both the literature, and the resulting mail, began surfacing last fall, and the campaign has accelerated in recent weeks. Mondale's office alone is receiving about 1,600 letters a week on the Child and Family Services Act, nearly all of it furiously criticizing nonexistent provisions of the bill.

Brademas said no one in Congress has been able to pinpoint responsibility for the inflammatory literature most parents seem to be relying on as they write to protest the bill. "We think some of it is originating in McLean, Va., and in Washington, but we can't identify the sponsors as yet," he said.

The principal document angry constituents seem to be accepting as gospel is a two-page, unsigned mimeographed flyer entitled, "Raising Children—Government's or Parents' Right?"

The anonymous circular, which urges readers to write to President Ford and their congressmen, asserts the Mondale-Brademas bill "would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the government."

Quoting from the Congressional Record, without identifying the source of the material cited or the date it appeared, the flyer claims the "Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council on Civil Liberties" has been made "a part of" the pending legislation.

It then proceeds to quote excerpts from this charter and to embellish the citations with explanatory comments.

"All children have the right to protection from, and compensation for, the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds," the flyer quotes the charter as saying.

"In other words," the literature explains, "never punish your child because he may come back on you with a civil suit."

Another charter excerpt reads: "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."

The circular interprets this "right" to mean that "if the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it."

"Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination," the next alleged charter excerpt states.

"That means," the flyer helpfully explains, "that you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. This also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, nor any ideas, about God."

The only difficulty with all this is that it is a pure fabrication, at least as far as the actual legislation now before Congress is concerned.

"It's a complete fraud," Modale said, "None of it is in our bill, but people think it's fact. There's so much cynicism and frustration about government, they're ready to believe anything."

After extensive research, backers of the Child and Family Services Act have traced the Congressional Record quotations cited in the anonymous literature back to the 1971 Senate debate on the predecessor legislation which Nixon vetoed.

The quotations, they have discovered, were drawn from extraneous material inserted into the Record by Sen. Carl Curtis, R-Neb., none of which had anything to do with the bill then under consideration—let alone the existing proposal.

The "Charter of Children's Rights," which the scare pamphlet contends has been incorporated into the Mondale-Brademas bill, was actually the product of a British organization and has never received any consideration in this country.

Brademas said it was bad enough to have "outright falsifications" spread around the country by unidentified "right wing radical extremists," but added that the misreprerentations have been multiplied by irresponsible newspapers and broadcast outlets in many states.

"On the major television station in my own town (South Bend, Ind.), I heard a very sarcastic attack on the bill which was obviously based on this scare literature," he said.

"When I called the news director to complain, he admitted he hadn't read the bill or bothered to call me for an explanation of its contents. They ultimately broadcast a retraction."

The problem, Brademas said, is that "once you tell the big lie, it's very difficult to correct. I don't mind criticism of the bill, and I don't mind opposition—there's plenty of room for disagreement.

"What I do object to is this deliberate falsification of the contents of the legislation," Brademas said.

There is plenty of legitimate opposition to the bill, which would provide up to $1.8 billion over the next few years for day care maternal and child health programs, food and nutritional services and aid for handicapped children.

The Ford administration, like the Nixon White House before it, opposes the legislation for both fiscal and philosophical reasons.

"We do not believe that the American people have reached a consensus that the federal government should provide the kind of mass developmental day care for preschool children envisioned in this bill," said former HEW Secretary Casper W. Weinberg in testimony last summer.

Nonetheless, apparoximately 100 major educational, religious, charitable and civic groups across the nation have endorsed the measure.

These include such diverse organizations as the National Education Association, the Salvation Army, the Southern Baptist Convention, the National PTA, the AFL-CIO, American Academy of Pediatrics, B'nai B'rith Boys Club of America and the National Association for Retarded Children.

Partly in response to criticism of the 1971 bill, the sponsors have stressed parental participation and supervision in most of the programs outlined in the current legislation.

The measure repeatedly emphasizes that all services provided are available on a purely voluntary basis, and that the underlying objective of the bill is to "strengthen family life," rather than destroy it, as critics fear.

"I've got a lot of respect for the good judgment and honesty of the American people," Mondale said. "This smear campaign may very well backfire on those who are conducting it.

"It may take time, but the need for child and family services legislation has been well documented. Sooner or later, we'll succeed in passing it," he said.

[From Congressional Record, Jan. 27, 1976]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES: FALSE INFORMATION HURTS VALID DEBATE

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of recent controversey about S. 626, the child and family services bill. Unfortunately, an unsigned "smear sheet" containing completely false information about this proposal has received wide circulation.

Like many of my colleagues, I have received numerous letters from concerned constituents, alarmed at what they had read. Once lies and false attacks have received wide distribution, refutation and emphasis on the real issues becomes all the more difficult.

For that reason, the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal has performed a valuable service in pointing out in a recent editorial that repeating the discredited information obscures the real debate which should be taking place about day care and services available to families.

I am a supporter of S. 626. But there are no doubt improvements that could improve the legislation and policy and economic questions which must be fully explored. That is the point made by this excellent, well-reasoned editorial, and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial from the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal, January 5, 1976, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

False Information Hurts Valid Debate

Things are not always what they seem.

That's the case with a widely-distributed leaflet which seeks to whip up opposition to child-care legislation now pending in Congress.

The leaflet cites nonexistent provisions in the bill and asserts the proposal would give the government, not the family, basic responsibility for bringing up children.

Some of the material in the leaflet is drawn from what opponents said during debate on a similar bill in 1971. Other material suggesting the bill would give children the right to disobey their parents is drawn from a proposal unsuccessfully promoted several years ago by a British group. It has nothing to do with the bill which has been introduced in Congress.

Primary sponsors of the bill have called the leaflet a deliberate attempt to spread false information.

Opponents of the child care bill say the scare campaign is hurting their cause because it affords the opportunity for proponents to label all opposition as being ultra-conservative and coming from "kooks."

There seems to be enough reasons for solid debate on the child bill without injecting false information into the discussions.

The proposed legislation would provide federal funding to support many types of comprehensive child-care programs. It carries a $1.85 billion price tag for the initial three years.

Sponsors have stressed participation in any child care program funded under the bill would be completely voluntary and parents would make up half of the membership of any group setting policies for these programs. The bill also states the family is the primary influence on child development and bans any interference with the "moral and legal rights" of parents.

Opposition to the bill centers around its stated cost and what it could escalate to; the belief the American people have not reached a consensus that the federal government should provide the kind of mass developmental day-care for pre-school children envisioned in the bill; that the federal government should not be in partnership with parents in the rearing of children and that regulations devised to implement the bill may go beyond the intent of the legislation.

The valid issues advanced by both proponents and opponents of the bill seem to furnish enough fuel for valid debate on the Child and Family Services Act. Persons who wish to express their opinions to their congressmen, should be sure they are based on solid information rather than an unfounded piece of propaganda circularized anonymously.

[From Congressional Record, Jan. 26, 1976]

Child and Family Services Act of 1975

(By Hon. Harold E. Ford of Tennessee in the House of Representatives)

Mr. Ford of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the confusion many of the people in my district feel in regard to the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. It has come to my attention that a leaflet is circulating in Memphis, and, as I gather from my distingushed colleagues, in other communities across the Nation. This leaflet contains false information which has misled many people. It claims that the Child and Family Services Act would allow the Government to take over responsibility for childrearing. Those who support the bill know that there is no such provision in it. The Child and Family Services Act would in no way interfere in family life.

As a result of this confusion, I released a statement to the local press in my district which point by point denounces the claims of the leaflet and which also attempts to clarify some of the bill's major provisions. I would like to share this statement with you:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD FORD

THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975, H.R. 2966/S. 626

In recent weeks leaflets have been distributed in Memphis and in other cities around the country which attempt to discredit "The Child and Family Services Act of 1975."

The leaflet purports to cite passages and quotes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in describing the provisions of the bill. These leaflets are totally false and misleading. They bear absolutely no resemblance to this legislation. For example: one leaflet indicates that there is a Child Advocacy Clause in the bill which would allow the government to come into a home and take over the responsibility of a child. There is no such clause in the bill. Indeed, the bill specifically states in Section 504 that "nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children".

The leaflet also indicates that there is a "Charter of Child's Rights" in the bill which would allow children to disobey their parents. The leaflets cites the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in listing the child's rights. The Charter of Child's Rights did appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On December 2, 1971, the Senate was debating a Conference Report on the Office of Economic Opportunity Act. This Act contained child care provisions. In the course of the debate Senator Carl T. Curtis of Nebraska stated, "In England, child development advocates have gone so far as to draft a Charter of Children's Rights". Curtis continued by reading from something he called "The Charter of Children's Rights" of the British Advisory Center of Education and the National Council for Civil Liberties". By misleading citation the leaflet implies that this material appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this year and that it represents the contents of the bill. There is no such Charter contained in this bill. I had never even heard of the Charter or this British group until I saw the leaflet and investigated the source of the Congressional Record statement.

This legislation is designated to provide the following services:

Proper prenatal care for mothers and health care for children to insure that they are not subject to handicapping conditions that could put them on welfare as adults;

Proper care for the children of working mothers who are desperately trying to stay off welfare;

Food programs to fight malnutrition which so quickly can ruin a child's body and mind.

In every instance, the Child and Family Services Act requires not only the parent's request for any service, but their participation is an many activities as possible.

As with any piece of legislation, this bill has supporters and opponents in the Congress. There is the question of whether the government should spend the amount of money this bill authorizes. There is the question of what services should be offered, and how they can be administered effectively and efficiently. These are the kinds of questions that must be debated and resolved by the Congress and the American people. They are precisely the issues which will be addressed by the Committee on Education and Labor when it considers this legislation.

The debate about this bill or any bill must be based on facts. This legislation provides needed services to help:

The over 200,000 children who are struck each year by handicaps because their mothers had not received early health care;

The 65 percent of all handicapped pre-school children who do not receive special services to help them overcome their handicap;

The 40 percent of all young children of this country who are not fully immunized against childhood diseases;

The working mothers of the five million children for which there are no spaces in licensed day care centers (statistics furnished by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth).

I want the people of Memphis to know the facts about this legislation. The person or persons who have prepared these leaflets—anonymously, I might add—are using scare tactics and outright lies in a campaign to deceive the people of Memphis.

There are really two issues here. One is the bill itself, whether or not I should support it based on the facts. The other issue is this smear campaign against the bill.

The first issue I can handle. I am always ready to hear opposing views from my constituents on any piece of legislation. My job is to inform my constituents to the best of my ability, to solicit their views, and to insure that when I cast my vote, it is a vote for Memphis.

The second issue, the distribution of these leaflets, is one that I cannot handle alone. For that reason I want to call upon the members of the press to investigate these leaflets. Take a hard look at these leaflets and compare to it the bill itself. The people of Memphis deserve to know the facts.

Thank you.

After I made this statement, the press did indeed examine the bill against the claims of the leaflet. The following editorial appeared in the Commercial Appeal in Memphis on January 26, 1976:

SMEAR ON CHILD CARE

An anonymous, unfounded campaign is being conducted across the country against a bill that would provide comprehensive daycare services for children. Claiming that the bill would take away the authority of parents over their own children, the campaign has tried to arouse anger and fear with fabrications and malicious implications contained in a widely circulated unsigned flyer.

The flyer quotes from statements in the Congressional Record, implying both that the opinions expressed are facts and that the information is current. But the quotes seem to have been pieced together from various statements made on Dec. 2, 1971, during a debate on an earlier child-care bill.

For one thing, the Record is a ponderous work, of fiction. Although its essential purpose is to report everything that is said and done in congressional sessions, it also includes just about anything the congressmen choose to insert. Speeches, excerpts from books, newspaper stories and editorials and a host of other miscellaneous matter choke the Record like Amazonian undergrowth. The rhetoric is grandiose and occasionally impressive, but any assumption of accuracy or factualness is ridiculous.

The bill in question, which is titled the Child and Family Services Act of 1975, has many reasonable, responsible critics. It has been challenged on grounds of cost, duplication and possible psychological harm to children caused by institutional care and day-long separation from a parent. Supporters argue that the bill would strengthen low-income families by providing the child [illegible] the care and experiences they need for normal development and by giving mothers a greater opportunity to raise their families' standards of living through work. The immediate issue, however, is the smear campaign. Until that is thoroughly discredited, it will be difficult for Congress to deal with the merits of the bill. One indication of the highly emotional controversy stirred up by the flyer is the fact that the bill's Senator sponsor, Democrat Walter Mondale of Minnesota, has received about 2,000 letters a week about it.

The flyer states, "The Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties is becoming part of the Child Development Act." That's a flat lie, unless the "act" referred to is not the Mondale bill. Such a possibility can't be discounted because of the flyer's deviousness. The national council is a British lobbying group. The flyer continues, "Following are four of the several items proposed in this charter (as taken from the Congressional Record 44138 . . ." They include assertions that children should be protected from inadequacies in their homes, from religious or political indoctrination (presumably by parents) and from "excessive claims made on them," which the flyer construes as encompassing household chores.

A grim prospect, indeed. But Mondale's office says no such charter or statement of rights has been proposed for the bill, nor would he approve of it. The Record quote comes from the 1971 debate, in which Sen. Carl Curtis (R-Neb.) cited the national council's charter during an attack on what he called the "child development" school of thought. He warned about the possibility of day-care centers becoming "child warehouses" as a "logical extension of that kind of rhetoric." The word "rhetoric" referred grammatically to the charter, not the bill.

Curtis did not say that the charter was becoming a part of any Child Development Act. Curtis told The Commercial Appeal that, while he opposes Mondale's bill on grounds of excessive federal regulation, he has not seen the flyer and could not comment on its contents. Other critics of the bill have specifically denounced the flyer. Onalee McGraw of the National Coalition for Children, which argues that the bill's approach to child development favors special-interest education groups, called the smear tactics counter-probuctive and a barrier to "true debate."

The flyer also attributes to the Record a statement that child advocates appointed by the government would be able to take over the education of children, "even within the home." In a careful reading of the 1971 debate, we could not find the quote. But there were pages of inserted comment, some of which had nothing to do with the earlier bill itself. Some, for instance, dealt with child-care programs in other countries. Be that as it may, Mondale's office says his bill does not contain the words "child advocate" or propose such a position.

In fact, the bill bans any infringement on the "moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotiona, physical or other development of their children." The proposed child-care services would be designed, set up and supervised by local councils, of which half the members would be parents with children in the program. The children would receive only those services that parents requested.

The Child and Family Services Act deserves an open, honest debate. The flyer is an underhanded, spurious attempt to play on the emotions of uninformed parents. It deserves nothing but ridicule. This is one more example of the danger of accepting as fact the material printed in the Congressional Record—material that can even be amended by congressmen if they have second thoughts about what they've said or inserted.

Although this editorial calls into question the credibility of articles appearing in the Record, I would like to note that the statement I have just made is an accurate account of the events which have transpired in regard to this bill.

I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to speak to you today.

[From Congressional Record, Jan. 26, 1976]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Mr. **MONDALE.** Mr. President, as many of my colleagues are aware, the Child and Family Services Act is being subjected to an outrageous and totally dishonest propaganda attack. Completely false allegations are being made that this legislation would somehow give children the legal right to disobey their parents; somehow prohibit parents from providing religious training to their children; somehow give the Government authority over child rearing; and somehow give children the right to complain about their parents and teachers "without fear of reprisal."

These charges are absolutely and completely false. There is not a shred of truth in any one of them. If there were, neither I nor any Member of Congress would be sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. President, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the public a letter I received from Archbishop Roach of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis.

Speaking for the bishops of Minnesota, Archbishop Roach denounces this attack on the Child and Family Services Act and specifically endorses the bill's protection of the rights of parents.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the public.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. PAUL AND MINNEAPOLIS,
St. Paul, Minn., December 15, 1975.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The Board of Directors of the Minnesota Catholic Conference met on December 10 and one of our items for discussion was an informational item concerning your Child and Family Services Bill.

The attacks on that bill are dishonest and we, as the Bishops of Minnesota, deplore them.

The bill would fill an urgent need and, at least as we read it, is very careful in providing proper protection for the rights of parents.

If this letter of support for your bill can be used to its advantage, we want to raise our voices in support of it.

Sincerely yours,

MOST REV. JOHN R. ROACH, D.D.,
Archbishop of St. Paul and Minneapolis.

[From Congressional Record, Jan. 19, 1976]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

(By Hon. James J. Florio of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives)

Mr. **FLORIO.** Mr. Speaker, throughout the past few months my office has received numerous pieces of correspondence concerning the Child and Family Services Act. As I am certain most of my colleagues can authenticate, many of these letters are emotionally charged containing falsified claims as to the consequences should this legislation be enacted.

To perhaps clarify this matter I am inserting the following article which explains some of the confusion and controversy surrounding the bill and dispels some of the myths which have been perpetrated.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 28, 1975]

CHILD-CARE AID BILL EVOKES PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

(By DAVID HESS)

WASHINGTON.—Congressmen from all over the country are being hit by a blizzard of mimeographed flyers urging them to reject a bill that would provide federal aid for care centers for children of working parents.

In a well-orchestrated propaganda campaign, the anonymous authors of the flyer charge that the Child and Family Services bill would "lead to a Soviet-style sysem of communal child rearing" and destroy parental authority over youngsters.

One of the bill's chief sponsors, Sen. Walter Mondale (D., Minn.), calls the campaign "one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

NO SUBSTANCE

Rep. Charles A. Mosher Jr. (R., Ohio), who has not yet decided whether to support the measure, said:

"I've heard accusations that this bill will do everything from destroying the basic family unit in the United States to indoctrinating preschoolers with a Communist-theist philosophy.

"These charges are all patently false. A careful examination of the proposed legislation shows there is absolutely no substance to these accusations."

The bill co-sponsored by Rep. John Brademas (D., Ind.), would provide federal grants to states, cities, counties, school boards or other local units that set up a comprehensive day-care program for the children of working or low-income parents.

LITTLE CHANCE

There is a hot debate raging over the federal standards that should apply to the day-care centers and over the range of services the centers should provide, and the bill is actually given little chance of passage.

But not one of the bill's identifiable opponents has even remotely suggested that it smacks of a Communist plot, as its anonymous detractors claim.

One opponent, Onalee McGraw of the National Coalition for Children, which favors tax subsidies for parents rather than federal grant for day-care services, says the propaganda campaign "does not serve the true debate on this bill."

The campaign's sponsors are sending their flyers to congressmen, and also are drumming up support in local churches—Mainly Baptist and Methodist—and in private, "Christian" schools.

CITE EXCERPTS

In almost every instance, the flyers cite excerpts from the Congressional Record, the daily journal of House and Senate proceedings, as "proof" of the bill's intent.

These excerpts, however, quote passages taken from a proposed "Charter of Children's Rights" published—but never adopted—in Great Britain, and from the opinions of senators who opposed a similar child care bill in 1972.

Neither the 1971 bill nor the 1975 Mondale-Brademas bill contain a single feature ascribed to them in the propaganda sheets.

In response to the campaign Brademas has issued an itemized rebuttal to the ananymous group's charges. He asserted that:

Participation in the day-care program is purely voluntary.

Policies for running each program would be set by local councils, half of whose members would have to be parents of children enrolled in the centers.

The bill contains a strict and specific ban against any council or government interference with "the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents."

Despite the explanations, congressional mail in opposition to the bill continues to roll in. Besides sending the flyers, individuals and church groups are writing separate letters that repeat most of the same points expressed in the flyers.

One 14-year-old Ohio boy, who said he attends a Christian school, wrote:

"Our country has and is going from a free, God-fearing nation . . . to a Satan-worshiping Communist country (in which) all religion is being abandoned."

He said enactment of the bill could lead to the shutdown of his school.

One Indiana couple wrote: "We feel this bill would destroy the family life America has known; not letting parents train their children as their conscience would direct them."

BLAMES BIRCHERS

A number of congressmen report receiving bundles of mimeographed flyers, urging them to reject the bill, from entire church congregations.

One congressional staff aide, noting the familiar John Birch Society envelope stickers on a lot of mail, blamed the campaign on the ultra-conservative Society.

But others believe the campaign is being sustained by certain church and religious school interests, who fear that stricter and more expensive federal standards for daycare services could threaten their own daycare operations.

[From Congressional Record, Jan. 8, 1976]

MICHIGAN CITY, IND., NEWS-DISPATCH HITS "SMEARMONGERS" WHO FALSELY ATTACK CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

(By Hon. John Brademas of Indiana, in the House of Representatives)

Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'Neill) called the attention of the House to the vicious smear campaign being conducted throughout the country by opponents of the child and family services bill, which Senator Walter Mondale and I, along with 122 other Members of the House and Senate, of both parties, are sponsoring.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that this poison still spreads. In recent days my office has been advised that the unsigned flyer which contains the false and misleading charges about the bill is now being circulated in parts of North Carolina, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Hampshire, as well as the long list of other States which Mr. O'Neill cited.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time I am pleased to report that an increasing number of responsible journalists have been publishing news stories and editorials countering the smear campaign. One such newspaper, the Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch, has not fallen prey to the false allegations concerning the bill and has, instead, published an excellent article on the subject:

SMEARMONGERS

Distortion of facts to advance a cause—or to deter one—is deceitful and wrong, whether it is done by a political administration, by a news medium, or by an organization.

When it is done in anonymity, as is the case with a current smear campaign against the proposed federal Child and Family Services Act, it is even more repugnant.

Third District Cong. John Brademas is one of the sponsors of the act. His office has received hundreds of letters about the bill which have been written in response to the anonymously circulated material. There even have been instances of TV and newspaper editorials based on propaganda.

Sen. Walter Mondale, the cosponsor of the bill, said it is "being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

The legislation—as written, not as distorted in the propaganda—is controversial. There are aspects to it, as Rep. Brademas said in a speech in Michigan City Sunday, which certainly call for rational debate in Congress and criticism by citizens who disagree with the concept of expanded federal funding of child care services.

But a smear campaign is something else. And this one, like all of them, serves only to thoroughly discredit those who create it or abet it.

A SELECTION OF VERSIONS OF THE ORIGINAL FLYER

THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975

Congress is considering a bill - The Child and Family Services Act of 1975, which,if passed and signed by President Ford,would take a huge step toward giving the government control of America's children, diminishing greatly the influence of a child's natural parents. The bill is sponsored in the Senate by Walter Mondale of Minnesota and is designated S. 626. John Brandemas (a bachelor from Indiana), introduced it into the House of Representatives, as H.R. 2966. In the Congressional Record the bill is described: " IF,IN THE JUDGMENT OF THOSE WHO ARE IN CHARGE OF SUCH A PROGRAM,THE STATE BY THE WAY OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, PARENTS ARE NOT GOING A GOOD JOB, THE ADVOCATE (a specialist appointed by the government) WOULD ENTER THE HOME AND DIRECT THE EDUCATION, EVEN WITHIN THE HOME. AND IF THE PARENT WOULD OBJECT, THE AUTHORITY OF THE HOME, DE FACTO BE TRANSFERRED TO THOSE ADVOCATED."

BELOW ARE FOUR OF THE SEVERAL ITEMS PROPOSED IN THIS AND OTHER BILLS OF LIKE NATURE:
Congressional Record Page 44133:

1: " All children have the right of protection and compensation for the consequences of adequacies in their homes and backgrounds."

2: " Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."(The question was asked by way of example: "What do you mean by "excessive claim?" The example was given: " If a parent asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to the parents have no right to insist upon it.)

3: " Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination." (This means that parents could not insist on children attending Church, Sunday School, or Synagogue. It also means the parents could be reported to authorities for expressing himself in his own home before his own children regarding politics and religion if the child reported this to the authorities.

4: " Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear or reprisals."

****

This bill passed both houses in 1971 and was vetoed by President Nixon with the following remarks: " This bill would weaken the American Family by committing the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of Communist approaches to child rearing over and against the family oriented approach of America."
" What is at issue is whether the parent shall continue to have the right to mold the character of the children or whether the State, with all its power and magnitude shall be given the decisive tools and techniques for forming the young lives of the children of this country."

CHRISTIANS SHOULD OPPOSE THIS ACT BY EVERY MEANS POSSIBLE....THIS COULD BE AN ATTEMPT TO SET UP THE MACHINERY FOR THE SOVIETIZATION OF THE AMERICAN FAMILY. CONGRESSMAN JOHN SCHMITZ HAS LIKENED IT TO THE YOUTH CAMPS OF HITLER'S NAZI GERMANY.

Dr. Reginald Lourie, president of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of children says: " We cannot trust the family alone to prepare young people for this new kind of world - not only are parents unnecessary, but they are too inept to rear their own children." (from Countdown).

CHRISTIANS AND LOYAL AMERICANS, let's storm Capital Hill with a flood of letters and protests the like of which has never been known. Send your letters of protest to

Sen. Jennings Randolph
Room 5721
New Senate Building
Washington,D.C. 20510
(S. 626)

Sen. Robert C. Byrd
Room 105
Old Senate Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
(S. 626)

Rep.John H. Slack, Jr.
Rayburn House Office
Building
Washington, D.C.20510

There is before the Congress of the United States Legislation known as: THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE ACT OF 1975.
House of Representatives RB 2965
626

CHILD ADVOCACY CLAUSE

"If, in the judgement of those who are in charge of such a program, The State by way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a specialist appointed by the Goverment) would enter the home and direct the education, even within the home. And if the parent would object, the authority of the home would, be De Facto be transferred to these advocated."

The Charter of the Children's Rights of the National council of Civil Liberties in becoming part of the Child Development Act. Following are four of the several items, preposed in this charter.

Congressional Record Page 44138:

1. All children have the right of protection from and compensation for the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds."
2. "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."
   (The question was asked by example. "What do you mean by the fact "excessive claim"? The example was given: "If the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn"t want to, the parents have no right to insist upon it.")
3. "Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination."
   This means parents could not insist on children attending church or Sunday school or Synagogue. (It also means the parent could be reported to authorities for expressing himself in his own home before his children regarding politics and religion if the child reported this to the authorities.
4. "Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without fear of repraisals."

This bill passed both houses in 1971 and vetoed by President Nixon with the following remark: "This bill would weaken the American family by committing the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of communal apporaches to child rearing over and against the family oriented apporach."

The Cehgressional Record states concerning this bill:
"The intent of this bill is for the Government to be responsible for the national interests of your child, and for all psychological interest of your child."
"What is at issue is whether the parent shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the State, with all its power and magnitude, shall be given the decisive tools and technicuhe for forming the young lives of the children of this country.
"As a matter of the child's rights, the Government whall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child isnot the care of the parents but the care of the State. We recognize further, that not parental, but communal forms of up bringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms Furthermore, there is serious question that we can not trust the family to prepare young children in this country for this new kind of world which is emerginig."

RAISING CHILDREN – GOVERNMENT'S OR PARENT'S RIGHT?

There is before Congress Legislation known as the Child & Family Service Act of 1975 (House: HR2966). If passed it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the Government.

In the Congressional Record we read: "If, in the judgment of those who are in charge of such a program (the State by the way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a 'Specialist' appointed by the Government) would enter the home and direct the education, even within the home, and if the parent would object, the authority in the home would, De Facto, be transferred to these advocated."

Charter of Children's Rights of the National Council of Civil Liberties is becoming a part of this Child Development Act. Following are four of the several items proposed in this charter. They can be found on page 44198 of the Congressional Record.

1. "All children have the right of protection from, and compensation from the consequences of any inadequancie in their homes and background." (Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back to you with a civil suit.)

2. "Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority." The question was asked, by way of example, what do you mean by the fact – "Excessive Claim" and the example was given, "If the mother or father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child didn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it."

3. "Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination." That means that you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. That also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, or any ideas, about God.

4. "Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents, and others without fear of reprisals." This speaks for itself.

This piece of legislation was vetoed in 1971, but it is back on the floor of Congress and now has the votes to be passed. It is our obligation to tell our legislation and our U.S. Representatives what we think of this legislation. Only our complaints can change their minds. They take your vote seriously. Take the trouble to write, or suffer the consequences of your silence.

Can the Government Take Away Your Children?

Comprehensive Child Development, the Soviet style system of communal child rearing which almost became law in this country in 1971 is once again being pushed through congress. The current bills HR2966 (House of Representatives) and (Senate) are virtually identical to the original act passed in 1971, but fortunately vetoed by the then president, Nixon. Now it is known as the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 and any changes made are merely cosmetic.

In vetoing the original bill which would have removed children from their parents' instruction shortly after birth, Mr. Nixon said that it would weaken the American Family by committing "the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family oriented approach."

We are in serious danger of "Sovietizing" the education of our children if we let the Child & Family Services Act of 1975 pass. Those who support this Act in the congress are convinced that it will "Sail through the House."

According to the Congressional Record, the intent of this bill is for the government to be responsible "for the nutritional interests of your child, for all psychological interests of your child."

THE FOLLOWING EXCERPTS ARE TAKEN FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS:

"What is at issue is whether the parents shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the State, with all its power and magnitude, shall be given the decisive tools and techniques for forming the young lives of the children of this country."

("We" in this quote refere to the government.)

"As a matter of the Child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents but the care of the State. We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms. Furthermore, there is serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children in this country for this new kind of world which is emerging.

TO REPLY TO THIS BILL WRITE TO:
CHAIRMAN OF EDUCATION COMMITTEE
JOHN BRADEMAS – RABURN HOUSE OFFICE – RM. 2181
WASH. D.C., 20515

RAISING CHILDREN - GOVERNMENT'S OR PARENT'S RIGHT?

There is before Congress Legislation known as the Child & Family Service Act of 1975 (House: HR 2966). If passed, it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the Government.

In the Congressional Record we read: "If, in the judgment of those who are in charge of such a program (the State by the way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a 'Specialist' appointed by the Government) would enter the home and direct the education within the home, and if the parent would object, the authority in the home would, De Facto, be transferred to these advocated."

"What is at issue is whether the parents shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the State, with all its power and magnitude, shall be given the decisive tools and techniques for forming the young lives of the children of this country."

("We" in the following quote refers to the government) "As a matter of the Child's right, the government shall exert control over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of the parents but the care of the State. We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms. Furthermore, there is serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children in this country for this new kind of world which is emerging."

TO REPLY TO THIS BILL WRITE TO: CHAIRMAN OF EDUCATION COMMITTEE MR. JOHN BRADEMAS, RABURN HOUSE OFFICE, ROOM 2181, WASHINGTON, DC, 20515. ALSO WRITE YOUR REPRESENTATIVES IN WASHINGTON STATING YOUR OPPOSITION TO THIS BILL.

US Senator Alan Cranston	Rep. Harold T. Johnson
452 Russell Senate Office Bldg.	2347 Rayburn Bldg.
Washington, DC, 20510	Washington, DC, 20515

Raising Your Children

GOVERNMENT'S OR PARENT'S RIGHT?

There is before Congress legislation known as the *Child and Family Service Act of 1975* (Senate: 8262 and House: HR 2966). If passed it would take the responsibility of the parents to raise their children and give it to the government.

CHILD ADVOCACY CLAUSE

In the Congressional record we read: "If, in the judgement of those who are in charge of such a program (the State, by way of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare), parents are not doing a good job, the advocate (a "Specialist" appointed by the government) would enter the home and direct the education, even within the home. And, if the parent would object, the authority in the home would defacto, be transferred to those advocated."

CHARTER OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CIVIL LIBERTIES is to become a part of this Child Development Act. Following are four of the several items proposed in this charter. They can be found on page 44138 of the Congressional Record.

1. **"All children have the right to protection from, and compensation for the consequences of any inadequacies in their homes and backgrounds."** Note: In other words, never punish your child because he may come back on you with a civil suit.
2. **"Children have the right to protection from any excessive claims made on them by their parents or authority."** The question was asked, by the way of example, what do you mean by the fact of "excessive claim"? The example was given: "If the mother or the father asked the child to take the garbage out and the child doesn't want to, the parents have no right to insist on it."
3. **"Children have the right to freedom from religious or political indoctrination."** That means you have no right to insist on taking them to church, if they do not wish to go. This also means they have the freedom to insist that they be taught nothing, nor any ideas, about God.
4. **"Children shall have the freedom to make complaints about teachers, parents and others without the fear of reprisals."** This speaks for itself.

This piece of legislation was vetoed in 1971, but it is back on the floor of Congress and now has the votes to be passed. It is our obligation to tell our legislators what we think of this legislation. Only your complaint can change their minds. They take your vote seriously. Take the trouble to write or suffer the consequences of your silence.

CAN THE GOVERNMENT TAKE AWAY YOUR CHILDREN?

Comprehensive Child Development, the Soviet-style system of communal child rearing which almost became law in 1971 is once again being pushed through Congress. The current bills are virtually identical to the original act passed in 1971, but fortunately vetoed by President Nixon. Now it is known as the CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975 and any changes are merely cosmetic.

In vetoing the original bill which could have removed the children from their parents' instruction shortly after their birth, Mr. Nixon said that it would weaken the American family by committing "vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family approach."

We are in serious danger of "Sovietizing" the education of our children if we let the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 pass. Those who support this Act in Congress are convinced that it will "sail through the House".

According to the Congressional Record, the intent of the bill is for the government to be responsible . . . for the nutritional interests of your child and for all *Phychological interests of your child.*

The following excerpts are taken from the Congressional Record:

"What is at issue is whether the parent shall continue to have the right to form the character of the children or whether the State, with all its power and magnitude shall be given the decisive tools and techniques for forming the young lives of the children of this country."

"As a matter of the child's rights, the government shall exert controls over the family because we have recognized that the child is not the care of their parents but the care of the State. We recognize further that not parental, but communal forms of up-bringing have an unquestionable superiority over all other forms. Furthermore, there is a serious question that maybe we cannot trust the family to prepare young children for this new kind of world which is emerging."

This all smacks of Communism. This is what in fact has been and is being done in Russia. This is what can become the law of our land, if the CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975 is passed by the Congress. We elected this Congress, but do we know what they are attempting to do to our freedoms and our rights? **PLEASE WRITE:**

President Gerald Ford, White House, Washington DC 20500

Your Congressman, House Office Building, Washington DC 20515

Your Senators, Senate Office Building, Washington DC 20510

I Protest the CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975!

SIGNED: ....

ADDRESS: ....

CITY: ....

Addtl. copies of this petition @ 20 for $1., 125 for $5., 500 for $17., 1,000 for $30. Order from Liberty Bell Publications, Reedy, W.Va. 25270.